ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΩΝ

Η, Θ, Ι

ΠΟΛΥΜΝΙΑ ΟΥΡΑΝΙΑ ΚΑΛΛΙΟΠΗ

MACMILLAN AND CO., Limited
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, Ltd.
TORONTO

HERODOTUS

THE SEVENTH, EIGHTH, & NINTH BOOKS

WITH

INTRODUCTION, TEXT, APPARATUS, COMMENTARY,
APPENDICES, INDICES, MAPS

BY

REGINALD WALTER MACAN, D.Litt.

UNIVERSITY READER IN ANCIENT HISTORY
MASTER (SOMETIME FELLOW AND TUTOR, FORMERLY SCHOLAR) OF
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

VOL. I.—PART II

BOOKS VIII. AND IX. (TEXT AND COMMENTARIES)

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1908

TRIBUS VIRIS ILLUSTRIBUS

HENRICO STEIN

HENRICO VAN HERWERDEN

ALUREDO HOLDER

HOC VOLUMEN

D.D.D.

EDITORIBUS EDITOR

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Book VIII.	Ourania	357
Book IX.	Kalliope	595

ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ

ΟΥΡΑΝΙΑ

Οἱ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἐς τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν ταχθέντες ἦσαν οἵδε, Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν νέας παρεχόμενοι ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι καὶ 1

ΟΥΡΑΝΙΑ Η ΑΒ : *οὐρανία* | *ἡροδότου ἱστοριῶν ὀγδόη d* **1.** 1
οἱ δὲ : *ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὕτω λέγεται γενέσθαι· οἱ δὲ* codd. *z* (nisi quod R om. *δή*, V pro *ταῦτα* exhib. *αὗτα*) || *ἑλλήνων ἐς* **α** : *ἕλληνες* **β**C || *τὸ* B 2
ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατόν **β**, Holder

1. 1. οἱ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἐς τ. ν. στ. ταχθέντες refers (*a*) to the *colon* immediately preceding, *ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὕτω λέγεται γενέσθαι*, and now forming the close of the seventh Book (cp. App. Crit.). But (*b*) if 7. 239 is a late insertion (cp. notes *ad l.*), the grammatical correspondence may have been originally, and more happily, with the closing words of 7. 238 *οἳ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἐποίευν τοῖσι ἐπετέτακτο ποιέειν.* Yet perhaps (*c*) the original correspondence lay with the first sentence of 7. 234 *οἱ μὲν δὴ περὶ Θερμοπύλας Ἕλληνες οὕτω ἠγωνίσαντο*, both Demaratos episodes, as well as 7. 238, which now intervene, being of the second or third redaction. The true contrast and correspondence lies between 'the Hellenes comprised in the naval forces' and 'the Hellenes brigaded at Thermopylai,' and the navy-list which here follows (*d*) really carries back to the army-list given above 7. 202. The transition between Bks. 7 and 8 is, indeed, abrupt, but the better inference from the abruptness of the transition is not (with Stein[5]) to a lacuna (*Ausfall im Texte*) but to an insertion, or to insertions, in the text by author and by interpolator to boot, destructive of the original continuity. The abruptness has been at once emphasized and obliterated by the division into books, made (by some anonymous Alexandrian), naturally enough, just at this point. The result has been still further to divorce the synchronous and inter-related operations on land and sea, the stories of Thermopylai and of Artemision as narrated by Hdt., on which point see further, Introduction, § 11, Appendix V. *Ἑλλήνων* is, of course, a partitive genitive. **ἐς**, not 'against' but 'into'; cp. 7. 21 *οἱ δὲ ἐς πεζὸν ἐτετάχατο.*

ἦσαν οἵδε. The sources of the Greek navy-lists for Artemision (here) and Salamis (cc. 43–48 *infra*) cannot be exactly determined; but if Hdt.'s figures are ever to be trusted, it is in these two cases, the rather in view of his omission of all details for the fleet in the following year (c. 131 *infra*). See further, Introduction, § 10, and the notes on the details below.

2. **Ἀθηναῖοι.** The order here is determined by the size of the respective contingents, or perhaps by the (Athenian) provenience of the list (in contrast with the list of Salamis, cc. 43–48 *infra*). To the 127 ships here specified are to be added the 53 supplied in c. 14 *infra*, besides the 20 manned from Chalkis, just below, making a total of 200 bottoms from Athens, on which figure cp. 7. 144. With the use of the middle (*παρεχόμενοι*) for the war-ships (*νέας*), manned by the Athenians themselves, cp. the active (*παρεχόντων*) just below for the ships furnished to the men of Chalkis.

ἑπτά· ὑπὸ δὲ ἀρετῆς τε καὶ προθυμίης Πλαταιέες, ἄπειροι τῆς ναυτικῆς ἐόντες, συνεπλήρουν τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι τὰς νέας. Κορίνθιοι δὲ τεσσεράκοντα νέας παρείχοντο, Μεγαρέες δὲ εἴκοσι. καὶ Χαλκιδέες ἐπλήρουν εἴκοσι, Ἀθηναίων σφι παρεχόντων τὰς νέας, Αἰγινῆται δὲ ὀκτωκαίδεκα, Σικυώνιοι δὲ δυοκαίδεκα, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ δέκα, Ἐπιδαύριοι δὲ ὀκτώ, Ἐρετριέες δὲ ἑπτά, Τροιζήνιοι δὲ πέντε, Στυρέες δὲ δύο, καὶ Κήιοι δύο τε

---

5 τεσσαράκοντα *d* 6 καλχιδέες **B** || παρεχόντων σφι **B**Pz 7 δυώδεκα **B** 9 στυριέες **B** : τυρέες δ || Κήιοι Stein : κεῖοι **a** : κῖοι **B**

---

3. **ὑπὸ δὲ ἀρετῆς τε καὶ προθυμίης**: causal, and of psychological causality; cp. 1. 85 *ὑπὸ δέους τε καὶ κακοῦ ἔρρηξε φωνήν* (where the *κακόν* is external). The notice of Plataian valour and zeal is remarkable, and more generous than the recognition of their service at Marathon, 6. 108, 9. 27.

Πλαταιέες . . συνεπλήρουν. Blakesley argues that the verb implies more than merely service as *ἐπιβάται*. His contention is borne out by the remark *ἄπειροι τῆς ναυτικῆς* (sc. *τέχνης*) *ἐόντες*, which would be almost pointless if referred to *ἐπιβάται* alone. Cp. also *ἐπλήρουν* just below.

5. **Κορίνθιοι** supply but 40 ships, but are also represented by 400 hoplites at Thermopylai, 7. 202. Cp. also c. 43 *infra*.

Μεγαρέες supplying 20 ships still rank apparently as the fourth naval power in the confederacy.

6. **Χαλκιδέες.** Are these Athenian 'Kleruchs' (5. 77, 6. 100)? or natives of Chalkis? or both combined? Blakesley acutely remarks that 4000 men represent just the complement for 20 triremes; and it is possible that there is a relation between the 20 here and the 4000 there (*ll.c.*). But if so, the 4000 is probably an inference from the 20, and this passage is the older of the two (whether Hdt. himself or his authorities made the combination and drew the inference). This observation further strengthens the suspicion with which the figure 4000 is to be viewed (cp. my note to 5. 77), seeing that here the crews of these triremes may well have been natives of Chalkis and the Athenian Kleruchs serving merely, or mainly, as *epibatai* (=600. If the real number of Kleruchs was only 600, the story in 6. 100 would be more intelligible).

7. **Αἰγινῆται.** That Aigina sends only 18 ships to Artemision is curious: does the item include the ship of Asonides captured off Skiathos (7. 181)? The Aiginetan figure for Salamis is also perplexing; cp. c. 46 *infra*.

Σικυώνιοι are below their full strength with 12 ships; cp. c. 43.

8. **Λακεδαιμόνιοι** means, of course, the Spartan state. Doubtless the crews were composed of Helots, or at best Perioikoi; and perhaps there were few, if any, Spartiatai on board, except the Epibatai and officers. The Lakedaimonian contingent looks miserably small for the hegemonic power; but the service at Thermopylai is concomitant. Even at Salamis the Lakedaimonians muster only 16 ships, if c. 43 is to be trusted.

Ἐπιδαύριοι, unrepresented at Thermopylai, raise their contingent from 8 to 10 for Salamis (c. 43), and send only 800 Hoplites to Plataiai, 9. 28. Their best days were past (cp. 7. 99), or in the future, when the *ἱερόν* of Asklepios was to rise into oecumenical significance (cp. R. Caton, *The Temples and Ritual of Asklepios*, Cambridge, 1900).

Ἐρετριέες. After their experiences in 490 B.C. (cp. 6. 101, 119) it is surprising to find men of Eretria in a position to supply even 7 ships in 480 B.C. Either the destruction had not been so complete as Hdt. asserts, or the place had been reoccupied and reinforced.

9. **Τροιζήνιοι.** Troizen was a small place, supplying but 5 ships (cp. c. 43); it ranked as the metropolis of Halikarnassos (7. 99), and appears to have been at this time on especially good terms with Athens; cp. c. 41 *infra*.

Στυρέες. The men of Styra in Euboia supply 2 triremes. In the Athenian tribute-lists Styra is assessed at 100 drachmai.

νέας καὶ πεντηκοντέρους δύο· Λοκροὶ δέ σφι οἱ Ὀπούντιοι ἐπεβοήθεον πεντηκοντέρους ἔχοντες ἑπτά.

2 *Ἦσαν μὲν ὦν οὗτοι οἱ στρατευόμενοι ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον, εἴρηται δέ μοι καὶ ὡς τὸ πλῆθος ἕκαστοι τῶν νεῶν παρείχοντο. ἀριθμὸς δὲ τῶν συλλεχθεισέων νεῶν ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον ἦν, πάρεξ τῶν πεντηκοντέρων, διηκόσιαι καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ μία. τὸν δὲ στρατηγὸν τὸν τὸ μέγιστον κράτος ἔχοντα*

10 *νῆας* **B** 11 *ἐπεβώθεον* **B**, van H. 2. 1 *οὖν* **B**: om. **a** 2 *ὡς τὸ*: *ὅσον τὸ* Reiske: *ὅσον τι* Schaefer: *quot* (*ὅσας*) Valla || verba *εἴρηται . . παρείχοντο* suspecta habet van H. 2, 3 *νηῶν* (bis) **B** 4 *μία καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ διηκόσιαι* **B**, Holder 5 *τὸ* om. **B** || *κάρτος* **a***dz*

Κήιοι. The island of Keos appears in the tribute-lists as assessed for 400 drachmai, though in 480 B.C. it furnishes but 2 pentekonters beyond the Styrean contingent. The assessment probably represents the resources of Keos better than the contingent: the island was the birth-place of Simonides, the poet-laureate of the war. Cp. 7. 228.

10. **Λοκροὶ . . οἱ Ὀπούντιοι**: cp. 7. 203. As they were serving *πανστρατιῇ* at Thermopylai it is a wonder to find them represented at Artemision even by 7 pentekonters.

σφι might naturally be referred to *Κήιοι* just before, as *σφι* up above certainly refer to *Χαλκιδέες* immediately preceding; but the general sense of the passage suggests a reference here to the fleet as a whole, all the contingents enumerated above, or more vaguely still *τοῖς Ἕλλησι*. The verb (*ἐπεβοήθεον*) is varied from the *ἐπλήρουν* and *παρείχοντο* preceding, and requires the personal object expressed or understood.

2. 2. **εἴρηται δέ μοι καὶ ὡς.** As the reference is to the immediate context, and as *ὡς* appears to be used in a doubtful sense, this whole sentence is naturally suspect. The verb *παρείχοντο*, too, is unfortunate, repeated, as it is, just below. Yet the *μοι* makes for authenticity, and there is a sufficient reason for the introduction of the sentence, the purpose of which is evidently to justify the *order* in which the ethnic names have been given, as corresponding to the relative strength of the respective contingents. A. G. Laird in *Class. Rev.* xviii. 1904, 97 ff. suggests, on the analogy of an Ionic inscription *circa* 400 B.C., that Hdt. might have intended *εἴρηται* (= *εἰρέαται*) as a plural; a *corruptela* might seem the simpler alternative. The difficulty in the sentence appears to arise less from the use of *ὡς* to signify the order of the list than from the presence of *καί* and *τό* (*πλῆθος*). The sentence would certainly be easier if it ran *εἰρέαται δέ μοι ὡς καὶ* (*τὸ*) *πλῆθος ἕκαστοι* (*τῶν*) *νεῶν παρείχοντο.* The article, however, may be referred in the first place to the particular contingents, taken severally, and in the second place to the total fleet; but the words *καὶ ὡς*, especially in that order, appear suspicious.

3. **ἀριθμός.** The total 271 agrees with the items. Diodoros 11. 12 gives 280 as the total, including, apparently, the 9 pentekonters.

4. **πάρεξ τῶν πεντηκοντέρων.** It is apparently to be understood that the only pentekonters were the two from Keos and the seven from Opuntian Lokris enumerated above. There were some still smaller and lighter boats in commission (cp. c. 21 *infra*), though not included in the navy-list.

5. **τὸν δὲ στρατηγόν.** Each of the distinct contingents enumerated above was presumably under an enchorial strategos: the process, by which the Spartan navarch (*ὁ Λάκων*) came to be commander-in-chief of the whole fleet, is not quite clearly exhibited by Hdt. The aorist (*ἔφασαν*) may here have temporally the force of a pluperfect, and the next chapter, not to say the very necessities of the case, will show that the question of the hegemony by sea and by land had been raised and determined before any operations at all were undertaken, probably at the Isthmus

παρείχοντο Σπαρτιῆται Εὐρυβιάδην Εὐρυκλείδεω· οἱ γὰρ σύμμαχοι οὐκ ἔφασαν, ἢν μὴ ὁ Λάκων ἡγεμονεύῃ, Ἀθηναίοισι ἕψεσθαι ἡγεομένοισι, ἀλλὰ λύσειν τὸ μέλλον ἔσεσθαι στρά-
3 *τευμα. ἐγένετο γὰρ κατ' ἀρχὰς λόγος, πρὶν ἢ καὶ ἐς Σικελίην πέμπειν ἐπὶ συμμαχίην, ὡς τὸ ναυτικὸν Ἀθηναίοισι χρεὸν εἴη ἐπιτράπειν. ἀντιβάντων δὲ τῶν συμμάχων εἶκον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι μέγα πεποιημένοι περιεῖναι τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ γνόντες, εἰ*

6 *εὐρυβιάδεα* SV : *εὐρυάδεα* R || *τὸν Εὐρυκλείδεω* z, edd. plures || *γὰρ* : *δὲ* R 7 *Ἀθηναίοισι* : *ἄλλοισι* Naber **3.** 1 *καταρχὰς* Pz 2 *ἐπὶ τὴν* **β** : *τὴν ἐπὶ συμμαχίῃ*? Kallenberg 3 *ἐπιτρέπειν* codd. 4 *μέγα τε ποιεύμενοι* coni. Stein, adm. van H.

in the previous year. Cp. further Appendix III. § 5, and c. 3 *infra*.

6. **Σπαρτιῆται**: the navarch was probably elected in the Spartan *Apella* to hold office for a year, beginning about the autumnal equinox (cp. Thuc. 5. 36. 1). Though 'Eurybiades son of Eurykleides' is the first Spartan navarch whose name has reached us, we are not justified in assuming that the office itself came into existence for and with him. It may have been of long standing, though of little importance, before the Persian war (cp. 3. 39). Eurybiades was not (perhaps) elected in view of the Persian war, but in the ordinary course of business; he is credited, by tradition, with little aptitude for the post, and in the two ensuing naval campaigns the command is entrusted to men of royal standing, Leotychidas, Pausanias.

7. **ἢν μὴ ὁ Λάκων ἡγεμονεύῃ**: this sentence, or else the words *Ἀθηναίοισι ἡγεομένοισι*, may be regarded as superfluous; the two conjoined are, indeed, logically inconsistent. What the allies declared was that (*a*) they would abandon the whole undertaking if the Athenians were to have the leading, (*b*) that they would join in the undertaking if the Spartans had the lead. Two further points may be remarked. (i.) The question of leading is not necessarily confined to the naval operations; *τὸ μέλλον ἔσεσθαι στράτευμα* has a more extended reference, actual or potential. (ii.) That being so *ὁ Λάκων* need not be referred specifically to Eurybiades, or even to the Spartan navarch (whoever he was, or was to be), but should be taken to refer generally to 'the Lakonian,' the man of Lakedaimon.

8. **λύσειν τὸ μέλλον ἔσεσθαι στράτευμα**: the two-fold, if not triple, future must place the declaration of the Symmachoi well before the despatch of the forces to Thermopylai-Artemision. *στράτευμα* is used by Hdt. both for 'expedition' (e.g. 3. 49 = *στρατεία*) and 'forces' (= *στρατός* 7. 48). Whichever sense be here preferred, the application need not, and indeed cannot, be restricted to the navy, for the defence of Thermopylai and Artemision is a single undertaking, a single plan.

3. 1. **κατ' ἀρχάς**: the dating is not quite precise, even with the additional indication *πρὶν ἢ καὶ ἐς Σικελίην πέμπειν*. The question of the *Hegemonia* was doubtless one of the first to be decided, but it can hardly have been intercalated between the mission to Argos, 7. 148 (where, by the way, the Argives demand *ἡγέεσθαι κατὰ τὸ ἥμισυ*), and the mission to Sicily, 7. 153 ff. The dispute with the Athenian must have preceded both the other disputes, the stories of which imply that the hegemony is vested in Sparta. The *λόγος* here recorded, whether speech, demand, or argument, must have taken place (*ἐγένετο*) at the first meeting of the allies at the Isthmus, in the autumn or early winter of 481 B.C. The Athenians themselves (Themistokles ?), or some state friendly to Athens (Plataia ?), must have been its authors. The opposition of the allies here recorded must be identical with the opposition of the allies just above recorded in c. 2.

4. **μέγα πεποιημένοι**: the whole passage, down to the second **εἶκον** *infra*, introduces some obscurity into the argument or narrative, but is in itself clear enough, the subject *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι* being carried over or resumed apparently, at least as far as the second *εἶκον*.

The passive form *πεποιημένοι* is remarkable as the perfect or pluperfect

στασιάσουσι περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίης, ὡς ἀπολέεται ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὀρθὰ νοεῦντες· στάσις γὰρ ἔμφυλος πολέμου ὁμοφρονέοντος τοσούτῳ κάκιον ἐστὶ ὅσῳ πόλεμος εἰρήνης. ἐπιστάμενοι ὦν αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀντέτεινον ἀλλ' εἶκον, μέχρι ὅσου κάρτα ἐδέοντο αὐτῶν, ὡς διέδεξαν· ὡς γὰρ δὴ ὠσάμενοι τὸν Πέρσην περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου

5 στασιοῦσι **B** 6 νοέοντες **B** || στάσις . . εἰρήνης damn. Blakesley || τοσοῦτο **B** 8 μέχρις οὗ **B**P: μέχρι οὗ *z* 9 δὴ ὠσάμενοι: διωσάμενοι Bekker, van H. || πέρσεα **B***z*

of ποιέεσθαι. The tense does not appear to have a merely temporal force. Stein's emendation would spoil this aspect of the word.

5. **ὀρθὰ νοεῦντες.** Hdt. apparently applauds the patriotic modesty of the Athenians, and adds a stock *gnome* of but doubtful application to the case in question, unless, indeed, the Athenians had been contemplating actually coming to blows over the question. The gnome was hardly meant in the first instance to be applied to the case of an alliance or confederacy. 'Civil war (στάσις ἔμφυλος) is to war conducted by a state at unity with itself (πόλεμος ὁμοφρονέων) as war is to peace (εἰρήνη).' The gnome does not cover the still darker evil of στάσις and πόλεμος combined (cp. Thuc. 3. 82). The neuter **κάκιον** is observable.

8. **μέχρι ὅσου**: sc. χρόνου: but the phrase might still mean either *dum* (while, so long as) or *donec* (until the point when). The exact rendering must depend upon the sense in which the words immediately succeeding are taken.

κάρτα ἐδέοντο αὐτῶν. What is the subject of ἐδέοντο, and to whom does the word αὐτῶν refer? The exact meaning of ἐδέοντο may also be in question. If there is no change of subject, if the subject of all the final verbs (εἶκον, ἐδέοντο, διέδεξαν, ἐποιεῦντο, ἀπείλοντο) is 'the Athenians,' then the passage contains a distinctly unfavourable judgement upon the conduct of Athens, thereby conflicting not merely with the general Atticism of Hdt., but with the immediate context, wherein their patriotism, their pan-Hellenism, has been commended. 'The Athenians, however, made these concessions only so long as they were badly in need of them (the allies? or the Lakedaimonians? in preference the latter); for as soon as they had repulsed the Persian, and were carrying the war into the enemy's country, they deprived the Lakedaimonians of the lead on pretext of the violence of Pausanias.' But there is something to be said for a change of subject. The repulse of the Persian, and the war in Ionia or Thrace, were not simply the doing of the Athenians: ὠσάμενοι, ἐποιεῦντο, ἀπείλοντο should hardly be referred exclusively to the Athenians, but rather to 'the allies,' or 'the Hellenes'; in which case αὐτῶν will refer to 'the Athenians,' and the meaning will be: 'the Athenians gave way and yielded, until such time as they (the allies, the Greeks) had sore need of them (or possibly 'petitioned them'), as they showed: for the Greeks, after repulsing the Persian, etc.' The words ὡς διέδεξαν are in any case against the alternative rendering of ἐδέοντο, for it would be intolerably harsh to take 'the Greeks' as the subject of ἐδέοντο and ἐποιεῦντο, but resume 'the Athenians' as the subject of the intercalary διέδεξαν. If, however, the subject of ἐδέοντο is οἱ σύμμαχοι, there is some confusion of thought in the passage, as the allies, or Hellenes, who deprived the Lakedaimonians of the naval hegemony at Byzantion in 477 B.C., were quite different persons and states from the allies who refused naval hegemony to the Athenians in 481 B.C. The story of the transfer is told, from an Attic point of view, Thucyd. 1. 95, Diodor. 11. 44, Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 23, etc. (Cp. G. F. Hill, *Sources*, i. 18 ff.)

This passage has a bearing on the question of the composition, plan, and completion of the work of Herodotus. He could hardly have expressed himself as here, or concluded this prospective episode with the summary ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὕστερον ἐγένετο, had he been intending to carry his narrative below the point where it now terminates, viz. the siege of Sestos in 479–8 B.C. In other words, this passage supports the view that the work of Hdt., as we have it, is finished and complete, according to

ἤδη τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐποιεῦντο, πρόφασιν τὴν Παυσανίεω ὕβριν προϊσχόμενοι ἀπείλοντο τὴν ἡγεμονίην τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὕστερον ἐγένετο.

4 Τότε δὲ οὗτοι οἱ καὶ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον Ἑλλήνων ἀπικόμενοι ὡς εἶδον νέας τε πολλὰς καταχθείσας ἐς τὰς Ἀφέτας καὶ

10 ἐποιέοντο **B**   12 ἐγένοντο C   4. 2 νῆας **B** || ἐς τοὺς **B**

the author's own idea. Cp. Introduction, § 6.

10. **τὴν Παυσανίεω ὕβριν** is a remarkable expression, which might point to this passage being an insertion, cp. 9. 10 *infra*; but the phrase may be a current one, descriptive of the proceedings recorded more fully by Thuc. 1. 94, 95, and touched by Hdt. himself 5. 32.

4. 1. **τότε**: in contradistinction to the *ὕστερον* just above, or to the *κατ' ἀρχάς*, c. 3 *ad init.*; but the precise date is still in question, and is to be inferred, or extracted, from the words immediately following. The term *οὗτοι . . ἀπικόμενοι* denotes undoubtedly the same object as *οἱ στρατευόμενοι ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον* of c. 2, or again *οἱ ἐς τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν ταχθέντες* of c. 1; but the *τάξις*, the *στρατεία*, the *ἄπιξις ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον*, are successive epochs in the operations of the fleet, the last of which is here more precisely defined by the sight of the enemy's fleet already in position at Aphetai, albeit whether the occupation of Artemision by the Greeks here involved precedes or succeeds the occupation of Aphetai by the Persians is not quite clearly indicated in this context. A problem at once arises as to the relation of this narrative to the narrative in Bk. 7. There the occupation, or first occupation, of Artemision by the Greeks precedes by some time the appearance of the Persian ships at Aphetai (cp. 7. 177, 183, 195). The Greek fleet, in fact, apparently occupies Artemision before the Persian fleet has quitted Therme, and actually retreats from Artemision to Chalkis upon news of the Persian advance signalled from Skiathos (7. 183). But the three days' storm detains the Persian fleet *en voyage*, and not until the fourth and last day of the storm (7. 191), that is, the fifth day after leaving Therme, at earliest, could the Persian fleet have steered into Aphetai (7. 193). The Greeks have already resumed their station at Artemision on the third (or fourth) day of the storm (7. 192), and consequently it is the Persians on their way to Aphetai who lose fifteen ships to the Greeks already stationed, for the second time, at Artemision (7. 194). To harmonize this passage with that it must be inferred that the *ἄπιξις ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον* here in question is the second occupation of Artemision by the Greek fleet which in Bk. 7 precedes, not merely the arrival of the Persian ships at Aphetai, but apparently even their departure from the Magnesian strand. This harmony, indeed, Hdt. himself has apparently attempted. Stein finds a proof of this in the otherwise superfluous **καί** in this passage: a still clearer proof lies in the sentence **ἐπεὶ αὐτοῖσι παρὰ δόξαν κτλ.**, which clearly resumes the statement in 7. 192, *ἐλπίσαντες ὀλίγας τινάς σφι ἀντιξόους ἔσεσθαι νέας*. The attempt is clear; not so the harmony itself. For (1) the Greeks here on arriving at Artemision (for the second time) apparently discover the Persians before them at Aphetai; (2) the Greeks at once project a second retreat. But such a retreat at this point is out of the question, as inconsistent with the whole plan of defence for Thermopylai-Artemision, and also inconsistent with the brilliant success they have just achieved (according to 7. 194) in the capture of fifteen of the king's vessels. The conclusions are forced upon us that the two passages are in the main from different sources (the one here probably of European, the other, that in Bk. 7, of Asianic origin), and that Hdt. has been ill-advised in his attempt to harmonize them, especially in his duplication of the retirement, or supposed retirement, of the Greek fleet from Artemision. The doubling of his sources has also apparently doubled the storms, and complicated other episodes in the naval operations, for the reduction of which to the simpler issues see further, Appendix V.

2. **καταχθείσας**: *κατάγεσθαι* is the proper word for putting into land; cp. 6. 107 *καταγομένας ἐς τὸν Μαραθῶνα τὰς νέας ὅρμιζε οὗτος*.

στρατιῆς ἅπαντα πλέα, ἐπεὶ αὐτοῖσι παρὰ δόξαν τὰ πρήγματα τῶν βαρβάρων ἀπέβαινε ἢ ὡς αὐτοὶ κατεδόκεον, καταρρωδήσαντες δρησμὸν ἐβουλεύοντο ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου ἔσω ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. γνόντες δὲ σφέας οἱ Εὐβοέες ταῦτα βουλευομένους ἐδέοντο Εὐρυβιάδεω προσμεῖναι χρόνον ὀλίγον, ἔστ' ἂν αὐτοὶ τέκνα τε καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ὑπεκθέωνται. ὡς δ' οὐκ ἔπειθον, μεταβάντες τὸν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸν πείθουσι Θεμιστοκλέα ἐπὶ μισθῷ τριήκοντα ταλάντοισι, ἐπ' ᾧ τε καταμείναντες πρὸ τῆς Εὐβοίης ποιήσονται τὴν ναυμαχίην. ὁ δὲ Θεμιστοκλέης **5** τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐπισχεῖν ὧδε ποιέει· Εὐρυβιάδῃ τούτων τῶν χρημάτων μεταδιδοῖ πέντε τάλαντα ὡς παρ' ἑωυτοῦ δῆθεν

---

3 πάντα **B** 5 ἐβούλευον **B**, Holder: ἐβούλευον τὸν vel τὸ? Kallenberg 8 <τὰ> τέκνα van H. || τε om. **B**

---

3. **στρατιῆς ἅπαντα πλέα**: a reference to the king's encampment in Melis (7. 198–200) can hardly be excluded from these words.

αὐτοῖσι: the 'ethical' dative; the words **ἢ ὡς αὐτοὶ κατεδόκεον** are somewhat redundant, for they cannot be referred to *τῶν βαρβάρων* as subject.

τὰ πρήγματα: cp. 7. 10 (ll. 34 ff.).

4. **ἀπέβαινε** has the full imperfect sense; and likewise **ἐβουλεύοντο** just below.

5. **δρησμὸν . . ἔσω ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα**: apparently a further and still more craven flight than their supposed first move to Chalkis, 7. 182 *supra*; the change of phrase may be intended by Hdt. to mark the difference of the two occasions; but in reality the two were probably only one and the same, and the goal was neither the Isthmus, nor even Chalkis, but probably at most the bay of Aidepsos; cp. Appendix V. § 4.

6. **οἱ Εὐβοέες**: the term might seem to ascribe a solidarity to the peoples and cities of the island, which they certainly did not possess. Rationalistically the word might be interpreted of the Euboians *in loco*, chiefly those of Histiaia (c. 23 *infra*): critically viewed, it rather betrays the bad conscience of the narrator, or his source, by its vagueness.

7. **ἐδέοντο**, 'petitioned,' 'besought'; cp. cc. 3 *supra*, 132 *infra*.

8. **τέκνα τε καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ὑπεκθέωνται**: the women doubtless come in somewhere by implication, either with *τέκνα*, or with the *οἰκέται* (*οἱ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον πάντες*, Hesychius); cp. cc. 36, 41 *infra*, *ὑπεκθέσθαι* c. 41 *infra*, *ὑπεκτιθέμενοι* 5. 65, *ὑπέκκειται* c. 60 *infra*, *ὑπεξεκομίσαντο* 9. 6. The prepositions suggest the ideas of secrecy and safety, the subjunctive their design and intention.

9. **μεταβάντες**: here perhaps of psychological, as in 7. 73 of local movement.

τὸν 'Αθ. στρατηγόν incidentally implies a chief commander, although he must constitutionally have had nine colleagues. The form of expression **πείθουσι . . ἐπ' ᾧ τε** recurs *verbatim* 5. 65. **πρό** here is not merely causal, but locative. The story of the bribing of Themistokles on this occasion is a transparent scandal; cp. Appendix V. § 2.

A delightful inconsequence in this passage lies in the Euboians wanting Eurybiades to remain 'a little while,' just till they have cleared their families out of the island, while Themistokles gets the Greeks to hold on and fight three battles (*τὴν ναυμαχίην* !) on three successive days.

11. **ποιήσονται**: the voice, the mood, the tense, not to say the change of subject, are all observable, and point rather to the actual result than to any implied condition.

5. 2. **ἐπισχεῖν**, 'to hold on': a stronger term than *προσμεῖναι* or even *καταμεῖναι*, connoting a longer time, a larger purpose.

τούτων τῶν χρημάτων: partitive genitive, emphasized by **μεταδιδοῖ**.

3. **ὡς παρ' ἑωυτοῦ δῆθεν**: so on a subsequent occasion he presents to Eurybiades arguments which are not of his

διδούς. ὡς δέ οἱ οὗτος ἀνεπέπειστο, Ἀδείμαντος γὰρ ὁ Ὠκύτου ὁ Κορίνθιος στρατηγὸς τῶν λοιπῶν ἤσπαιρε μοῦνος, φάμενος ἀποπλεύσεσθαί τε ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου καὶ οὐ παραμενέειν, πρὸς δὴ τοῦτον εἶπε ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης ἐπομόσας "οὐ σύ γε ἡμέας ἀπολείψεις, ἐπεί τοι ἐγὼ μέζω δῶρα δώσω ἢ βασιλεὺς ἄν τοι ὁ Μήδων πέμψειε ἀπολιπόντι τοὺς συμμάχους." ταῦτά τε ἅμα ἠγόρευε καὶ πέμπει ἐπὶ τὴν νέα τὴν Ἀδειμάντου τάλαντα ἀργυρίου τρία. οὗτοί τε δὴ πληγέντες δώροισι ἀνα-

5. 5 ὁ Κορίνθιος Suidas (sub v. ἤσπαιρεν) cum v.l. Κορινθίων : κόρινθος C : κορίνθιος ceteri : Κορινθίων Schaefer, van H. || τῶν λοιπῶν om. **β** : 'fortasse est glossema' van H. 6 ἀποπλώσεσθαί **β**, van H. 10 νῆα **β** || τὴν alterum : τοῦ *dz* 11 πληγέντες **β***z*, Holder, van H., Stein[3] : πάντες **α**, Stein[1 2]

own devising, as though they were his own, c. 58 *infra*.

4. **ἀνεπέπειστο**: the pluperfect here has its full temporal force; but a shade of difference enters below, in ἀναπεπεισμένοι ἦσαν and ἐκεχάριστο.

Ἀδείμαντος . . ὁ Ὠκύτου: cp. 7. 137 *ad f.*, a passage which in part might explain the hostility of Athens to the memory of Adeimantos, were it not that the stories to the discredit of Adeimantos are surely far older than the exploits of Aristeas his son. The account of the bribery of Adeimantos by Themistokles at Artemision is, indeed, not merely absurd in view of the strategic necessities of the position, and obviously 'pragmatic'—to the discredit of Themistokles too; but it is flagrantly inconsistent with the stories of the relations between Themistokles and the Korinthian admiral just before the battle of Salamis. It is thus doubly significant that the version of the story followed by Plutarch, *Themist.* 7, omits Adeimantos altogether. If there is any truth in the tradition of the employment of money by Themistokles to procure a halt, to promote a battle, the scene must be laid at Salamis, not at Artemision, where the Peloponnesians could no more have thought of retreating than the Athenians themselves, as long as Leonidas was holding Thermopylai. The name and patronymic of the Korinthian strategos are here genuine, as the γάρ would show; cp. c. 59 *infra*. Aineas, son of Okytos, a Korinthian, appears among the signatories of the truce of Laches in 423 B.C., Thuc. 4. 119. 2. This second Okytos might well be a son of Adeimantos; the name is presumably connected with ὠκύς.

5. **ἤσπαιρε**: like a fish out of water, cp. 9. 120, or a babe new-born, cp. 1. 111, or (as Stein suggests, but without a reference) a bird in the hand of the fowler.

9. **Μήδων**. Did Themistokles, and the Athenians of his generation, speak of the 'Mede' rather than of the 'Persian'? cp. Aristoph., Thuc. The general colour of the stories of Artemision is decidedly Attic; Hdt. and the Ionians for at least a generation before him could clearly distinguish between Mede and Persian.

ταῦτά τε ἅμα ἠγόρευε καὶ πέμπει: the emphatic parataxis and the historic tenses are observable: 'the words were hardly out of his mouth before he sends to the Korinthian admiral's flag-ship three talents of silver.'

11. **πληγέντες**. The reading of the second class for πάντες (cp. App. Crit.), adopted by Blakesley and Baehr, from Wesseling, and now by Stein, on the ground that πάντες is inadmissible for δύο. Baehr compares Plutarch, *Demosth.* 25 πληγεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς δωροδοκίας, and other Plutarchisms more remote; Stein still thinks of bird-snaring, and cps. Horace, *Od.* 3. 16 *munera navium Saevos illaqueant duces.* It is easier to understand πάντες as a corruption of πληγέντες *ex librariorum quibus vulgatum durius visum ingenio* (Wesseling) than *vice versa*, or one might be tempted to see in πάντες a hint of a story of still more far-reaching corruption than that just related; at any rate, the *corruptela* was intended to cover 'all three.'

πεπεισμένοι ἦσαν καὶ τοῖσι Εὐβοεῦσι ἐκεχάριστο, αὐτός τε ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης ἐκέρδηνε, ἐλάνθανε δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔχων, ἀλλ' ἠπιστέατο οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν χρημάτων ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνέων ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ τὰ χρήματα.

Οὕτω δὴ κατέμεινάν τε ἐν τῇ Εὐβοίῃ καὶ ἐναυμάχησαν, **6** *ἐγένετο δὲ ὧδε. ἐπείτε δὴ ἐς τὰς Ἀφέτας περὶ δείλην πρωίην γινομένην ἀπίκατο οἱ βάρβαροι, πυθόμενοι μὲν ἔτι καὶ πρότερον περὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ναυλοχέειν νέας Ἑλληνίδας ὀλίγας, τότε*

---

13 *ἐκέρδανεν* **B**: *ἐκέρδησε* *d* 15 *Ἀθηνέων* Bekker, Stein[2 3]: *ἀθηναίων* codd., Stein[1] || *τὰ χρήματα* om. **B** **6.** 1 *δὴ* om. **B** 2 *τὰς*: *τοὺς* R 3 *γενομένην* **B***z* || *ἀπικέατο* P*z* 4 *τὸ* om. **a** || *νῆας* **B** || *τότε . . ἰδόντες* om. **B**

---

13. **ἀλλ'**: as though a negative had preceded, **ἐλάνθανε** having indeed a sort of negative force.

14. **ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνέων**: if we transfer the scene to Salamis we shall be convinced that the recipients were right in their opinion; and the purpose (**λόγος**, *ratio*) was to keep them at Salamis.

6. 1. **ἐν τῇ Εὐβοίῃ**: the officers and men were mostly ashore, even if the ships were not actually beached.

2. **ἐπείτε δὴ ἐς τὰς Ἀφέτας**: referring back (*δή*) not so much to c. 4 *supra*, as to 7. 195, or 193.

περί: here of time, as just below of place.

δείλην πρωίην γινομένην, 'the early afternoon'; cp. *δείλην ὀψίην γινομένην τῆς ἡμέρης* c. 9 *infra*. The present participle is more curious with the *πρωίην* than with the *ὀψίην*, as *δείλη* itself (whatever its derivation) means afternoon, in distinction from *ἠώς* and *μέσον ἦμαρ*. Cp. *Iliad* 21. 111. At what o'clock exactly we are to place the arrival (*ἀπίκατο* 7. 193) is unfortunately not clear: before 3 P.M.?

3. **πυθόμενοι μὲν ἔτι καὶ πρότερον**: cp. 7. 208. The Persian advance has been conducted with all due foresight and circumspection: the number of the Greek fleet does not apparently exceed their anticipations.

The construction (and sense) of the words **ἔτι καὶ πρότερον**, especially of *ἔτι*, is disputable. Are they to be taken together? Do they, if so taken, qualify *πυθόμενοι* or *ναυλοχέειν*? Or are they to be taken separately, and, if so, do *καὶ πρότερον* cohere, or are *ἔτι* and *πρότερον* co-ordinate? Finally, what is the exact sense of *ἔτι*? Stein takes *ἔτι* = *ἤδη* (*schon*); cp. 5. 62 *ἐόντες ἄνδρες δόκιμοι ἀνέκαθεν ἔτι*, 1. 65 *τὸ δὲ ἔτι πρότερον τούτων καὶ κακονομώτατοι ἦσαν*, 1. 92 *τὴν δὲ οὐσίην αὐτοῦ ἔτι πρότερον κατιρώσας κτλ.*, 1. 190 *ἐξεπιστάμενοι ἔτι πρότερον τὸν Κῦρον οὐκ ἀτρεμίζοντα*, 3. 64 *τῷ δὲ ἔτι πρότερον ἐκέχρηστο*, 6. 33 *αὐτοὶ γὰρ Κυζικηνοὶ ἔτι πρότερον τοῦ Φοινίκων ἐσπλόου τούτου ἐγεγόνεσαν ὑπὸ βασιλέι*. So also c. 69 *infra νομίζων ἔτι πρότερον σπουδαίην εἶναι τότε πολλῷ μᾶλλον αἴνεε*. But in no instance does *ἔτι* appear used with a verb simply as = *ἤδη*, but always as reinforcing a temporal adverb, generally *πρότερον*, and so in its normal (comparative) force of 'still'—the point of departure being the latest date, and the point of arrival not 'already' but 'still' and 'still' earlier. In c. 62 *infra ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἔτι*, where there is no comparison, the *ἔτι* may have its true (temporal) force. In none of these cases does a *καί* separate, or connect, the *ἔτι πρότερον*. The very peculiar case in 9. 102 *ἔτι καὶ δή* is now abandoned by Stein (cp. note *ad l. infra*). The *καί* here therefore remains a problem, most simply resolved by understanding it as intensive 'still even' (or 'even still') earlier, and taking the phrase as qualifying *πυθόμενοι* (c. 69 *infra*, quoted above, favouring this, as well as the *τότε δὲ αὐτοὶ ἰδόντες*). But if *ἔτι καὶ πρότερον* might be taken with *ναυλοχέειν*, then *καί* is disjunctive ('still as before,' referring to the reoccupation of the position); but the *τότε δὲ αὐτοὶ ἰδόντες* seems to forbid this.

4. **τότε δέ**: on their arrival at Aphetai, or on the way thither; in either case it appears here that the Greek fleet is already in position at Artemision (for-

δὲ αὐτοὶ ἰδόντες, πρόθυμοι ἦσαν ἐπιχειρέειν, εἴ κως ἕλοιεν αὐτάς. ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς ἀντίης προσπλέειν οὔ κώ σφι ἐδόκεε τῶνδε εἵνεκα, μή κως ἰδόντες οἱ Ἕλληνες προσπλέοντας ἐς φυγὴν ὁρμήσειαν φεύγοντάς τε εὐφρόνη καταλαμβάνῃ· καὶ ἔμελλον δῆθεν φεύξεσθαι, ἔδει δὲ μηδὲ πυρφόρον τῷ ἐκείνων
7 λόγῳ ἐκφυγόντα περιγενέσθαι. πρὸς ταῦτα ὦν τάδε ἐμη-

6 προσπλώειν **B**z, van H. 7 εἵνεκε R || κως z : πως **a** : om. **B** || προσπλώοντας **B**z, van H. 8 καταλάβῃ **B** : καταλάβοι Pz : καταλαμβάνει d 9 φεύξεσθαι Stein(2) 3, van H. : ἐκφεύξεσθαι 10 λόχω **B** 7. 1 ἐμηχανῶντο Stein2 3, Holder : ἐμηχανέωντο d : ἐμηχανέοντο ceteri, Stein1, van H.

the second time), before the arrival of the Persians at Aphetai; but if so, why did not the Greeks advance upon the Persians (especially if Aphetai should be placed within the entrance of the gulf of Pagasai)? The Persians do not advance at once for a frontal attack upon the Greeks (*ἐκ τῆς ἀντίης προσπλέειν*) for fear the Greeks should sail away and escape, through the Euripos, under cover of night; a squadron of 200 sail is detached to circumnavigate the island and take the Greeks in the rear, while the fleet from Aphetai will attack *ἐξ ἐναντίης* when the time arrives. The exposition of the plan ignores the bearing of the naval manœuvres upon the situation at Thermopylai: had the Greek fleet desired, and been allowed, to 'fly' from Artemision, Leonidas and his men were at the mercy of the Persians. The squadron detached to circumnavigate Euboia may have been directed rather against Thermopylai than against Artemision.

8. **εὐφρόνῃ καταλαμβάνῃ**. The noun is a poetic word for 'night,' cp. 7. 12. The verb is used in a favourable, or at least a neutral sense, here; cp. 3. 139.

9. **ἔμελλον δῆθεν φεύξεσθαι** seems to be not the writer's own opinion, but an idea spread among the Persians; the tone of the passage, therefore, hardly accords with the account of the Greek panic in c. 4 *supra*. (*ἐκφεύξεσθαι* is of course barely sense, but would accord better with referring the utterance wholly to the author.)

ἔδει δὲ μηδὲ πυρφόρον τῷ ἐκείνων λόγῳ ἐκφυγόντα περιγενέσθαι: *ἐκείνων* must refer to the Persians, but *τῷ ἐκείνων λόγῳ* cannot be intended to ascribe to Persian origin the obviously Greek, or Lakonic, proverb. The *Fire-bearer* was a Spartan official, but not perhaps to be found only at Sparta; cp. Xenophon, *Laced. resp.* 13. 2 *θύει μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον οἴκοι ὢν* (sc. *ὁ βασιλεὺς*) *καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ· ἢν δὲ ἐνταῦθα καλλιερήσῃ, λαβὼν ὁ πυρφόρος πῦρ ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ προηγεῖται ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρια τῆς χώρας· ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖ αὖ θύεται Διὶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ. ὅταν δὲ ἀμφοῖν τούτοιν τοῖν θεοῖν καλλιερηθῇ, τότε διαβαίνει τὰ ὅρια τῆς χώρας· καὶ τὸ πῦρ μὲν ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ἱερῶν προηγεῖται οὔποτε ἀποσβεννύμενον, σφάγια δὲ παντοῖα ἕπεται.* Cp. Suidas *sub v.* who says, *ἐν τοῖς οὖν πολέμοις εἰώθασι τῶν ἱερέων οἱ νενικηκότες φείδεσθαι.* This might be true of Greeks, but would not hold good for 'barbarians.' Canon Blakesley, however, denies the sacrosanctity of the *πυρφόρος*, and supposes only that he would be more likely than the fighting men to escape.

7. 1. **πρὸς ταῦτα ὦν**: pleonastic. The subject of **ἐμηχανῶντο** is understood, sc. *οἱ στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατοῦ*: cp. the (subsequent) conversation previously reported 7. 236. This device (*μηχανή*), of detaching a squadron (200 strong) to circumnavigate Euboia, and take the Greeks at Artemision (or Thermopylai?) in the rear, is here apparently dated after the arrival of the Persians at Aphetai. But (1) the direction to sail *ἔξωθεν Σκιάθου*; (2) the previous knowledge of the Persians concerning the positions occupied by the Greeks; (3) the curious introduction of the word *ἀπασέων*—i.e. 'while the ships were still in full force'; (4) the improbability of the Persians dividing their fleet, if they had just suffered the colossal losses recorded off Magnesia; (5) the probability that the storm has been duplicated in Hdt.'s narrative, and the Persian losses thereby enhanced; (6) and last, not least, the whole strategic development of the

χανῶντο· τῶν νεῶν ἁπασέων ἀποκρίναντες διηκοσίας περιέπεμπον ἔξωθεν Σκιάθου, ὡς ἂν μὴ ὀφθείησαν ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων περιπλέουσαι Εὔβοιαν κατά τε Καφηρέα καὶ περὶ Γεραιστὸν ἐς τὸν Εὔριπον, ἵνα δὴ περιλάβοιεν οἳ μὲν ταύτῃ ἀπικόμενοι καὶ φράξαντες αὐτῶν τὴν ὀπίσω φέρουσαν ὁδόν, σφεῖς δὲ ἐπισπόμενοι ἐξ ἐναντίης. ταῦτα βουλευσάμενοι ἀπέπεμπον τῶν νεῶν τὰς ταχθείσας, αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐν νόῳ ἔχοντες ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρης τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἐπιθήσεσθαι, οὐδὲ πρότερον ἢ τὸ

2 *νηῶν* **B** || *ἁπασέων* R: *πασέων* **a**V: *πασῶν* S || *περιέπεμψαν ἔξω* 3 *ὀφθέωσι(ν* V) **B**, van H. 4 *περιπλώουσαι* **B**, van H. || *περὶ* om. **B**, van H. || *γερεστὸν* **B** 5 *μὲν δὴ* **B** 7 *ἐξεναντίας* **B**: *ἐξ ἀντίης* malit van H. 8 *νηῶν* **B** 9 *ἐπιθέσθαι* *d*

operations, itself so superficially conceived by Hdt., make it probable that the squadron commissioned to circumnavigate Euboia was detached from the Persian fleet not at Aphetai, as Hdt. here seems to imply, but off the Magnesian coast, if not already, still earlier, at the start from Therme.

3. **ἔξωθεν Σκιάθου**: the island formed a channel with the Magnesian main, cp. 7. 176, 183, and was the objective of the Persian navy from Therme, 7. 179, and likewise the station of the three Hellenic cruisers on the outlook, *ibid.*, c. 92 *infra*, and a telegraph station, 7. 182. But from Aphetai, or from Artemision, to sail 'outside Skiathos' would be to sail northward between Skiathos and Peparethos, a mysterious, not to say senseless manœuvre, which would be fully in view of the Greeks at Artemision.

ὡς ἂν μὴ ὀφθείησαν. There is no need to prefer (with Blakesley, van H., and others) the *v.l.* *ὀφθέωσι*, as Hdt. uses the optative, with *ἄν*, after final *ὡς*, *ὅκως*, rather freely (cp. Heiligenstaedt, *de enunt. finalium usu*, i. 39).

4. **κατά τε Καφηρέα καὶ περὶ Γεραιστόν.** Kaphereus and Geraistos are the two headlands at the south-east end of Euboia, Kaphereus being the northern one, Geraistos the southern. Geraistos is mentioned again, 9. 105, as the burial-place of the Athenian pankratiast, Hermolykos, son of Euthoinos, the hero of Mykale, who fell subsequently in the war with the Karystians. The variation of the prepositions is observable: you might sail *περὶ Καφηρέα* and even *κατὰ Γεραιστόν* without getting round Euboia into the Euripos; but cp. App. Crit. The narrative here treats all these places as notorious, perhaps with a touch of Atticism. 7. 182, 5. 77 suggest that the term Euripos is restricted to the straits at Chalkis, though the other passages where the term occurs in Hdt. admit of a more extended reference.

5. **ταύτῃ**: sc. *ἐς τὸν Εὔριπον*.

6. **αὐτῶν**: the Greeks, that is, the Greek fleet; for Hdt. treats the contrivance throughout as directed against Artemision.

τὴν ὀπίσω φέρουσαν ὁδόν: by sea, not by land. *τῆς ὀπίσω ὁδοῦ* in quite a different connexion, 2. 87.

7. **ἐπισπόμενοι ἐξ ἐναντίης**: the Greek fleet being assumed to have taken to flight, *ἐξ ἐναντίης* signifies not so much a 'frontal attack' on the Greeks as an 'advance to meet' their own squadron.

8. **τὰς ταχθείσας**: i.e. the two hundred.

αὐτοί: i.e. the remainder, or rather the main fleet; if Hdt.'s figures were to be trusted, it would still have numbered upwards of 600 vessels.

ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρης: the day of their arrival at Aphetai, and, as afterwards appears, c. 15 *infra*, the day upon which the frontal attack upon Thermopylai had begun, 7. 210, the first of the great *Triduum*; cp. c. 15 *infra*, Appendix V. § 4.

9. **οὐδὲ πρότερον ἢ τὸ σύνθημά σφι**: they might have some time to wait for the signal that the circumnavigating squadron had arrived (in the Euripos? or where?). But where was such a signal to come from? No part or point of Euboia was as yet in Persian hands. The signal was to be given from the mainland — an unconscious indication that the circumnavigating squadron was directed rather against Thermopylai than

σύνθημά σφι ἔμελλε φανήσεσθαι παρὰ τῶν περιπλεόντων ὡς ἡκόντων. ταύτας μὲν δὴ περιέπεμπον, τῶν δὲ λοιπέων νεῶν ἐν τῇσι Ἀφέτῃσι ἐποιεῦντο ἀριθμόν.

8 *Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐν ᾧ οὗτοι ἀριθμὸν ἐποιεῦντο τῶν νεῶν, ἦν γὰρ ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τούτῳ Σκυλλίης Σκιωναῖος δύτης τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων ἄριστος, ὃς καὶ ἐν τῇ ναυηγίῃ τῇ κατὰ Πήλιον γενομένῃ πολλὰ μὲν ἔσωσε τῶν χρημάτων τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς περιεβάλετο, οὗτος ὁ Σκυλλίης ἐν νόῳ μὲν εἶχε ἄρα καὶ πρότερον αὐτομολήσειν ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ οἱ παρέσχε ἕως τότε. ὅτεῳ μὲν δὴ τρόπῳ τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν ἔτι ἀπίκετο ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἔχω*

10 *περιπλωόντων* **B**, van H. 11 *λοιπῶν* **B** || *νηῶν ἐπὶ τῇσι(ν* V) *ἀφετῇσιν* **B** 12 *ἐποιέοντο* **B** || *τὸν ἀριθμόν z* 8. 1 *τούτῳ* om. C || *ἐν ᾧ* : *ἐν τῷ* edd. nonnulli : *ἐν ᾧ . . νεῶν* secl. van H. || *ἐποιέοντο* **B** 2 *νηῶν* **B** 3 *ναυαγίῃ d* 4 *κατὰ τὸ dz* 5 *τῇσι* **B***z* || *περιεβάλετο* AR : *περιεβάλλετο* BSV 6 *αὐτομολήσειν . . οἱ* om. **B** 7 *ἕως* Cobet, van H., Stein[3] : *ὡς*

against Artemision. This conclusion supports the theory that 200 ships were detached from the Persian fleet off the Magnesian coast—or earlier. The voyage from Skiathos to the Euripos, round Kaphereus and Geraistos, could not be less than 200 (E.) miles; sailing night and day, under favourable circumstances, the squadron could hardly arrive at Chalkis, not to say at Thermopylai, in less than thirty-six hours (cp. 4. 86, where a ship is supposed to perform 1300 stades in a *νυχθήμερον*; but we have here 200 ships to move together, and a difficult channel to negotiate). It was, perhaps, hoped that the flying squadron would arrive in the rear of Thermopylai in the course of the third day (assuming it to have been despatched on the afternoon or evening of the first day).

10. **ἔμελλε φανήσεσθαι** is rather curious, for they must have been intending to await a definite signal, not merely to wait until a signal was about to be displayed. The futurity seems to be purely relative to their intentions at the moment of despatch, not on the eve of arrival.

12. **ἐν τῇσι Ἀφέτῃσι ἐποιεῦντο ἀριθμόν.** As had been done at Doriskos, 7. 59, 89, 100. Their losses by the storm were to be computed (cp. 7. 190). It is possible that some reorganization of the fleet was now attempted. Documents may have resulted from this numbering, but there is little to suggest that Hdt. or his authorities made use of them.

8. 2. **Σκυλλίης Σκιωναῖος**: Skyllias (cp. *Σκύλλα*, *Σκύλλη*) of Skione, the city on Pallene, 7. 123.

3. **δύτης τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων ἄριστος.** Had Hdt. believed the anecdote which he proceeds to relate he would perhaps have employed the formula *πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ἄριστος*. The term *ἀνθρώπων* is introduced perhaps because the water is not man's native element.

τῇ ναυηγίῃ τῇ κατὰ Πήλιον γενομένῃ: cp. 7. 188–91, and the luck of Ameinokles, 7. 190. **περιεβάλετο**, *ibid.* **ἦν γὰρ . . οὗτος** shows a slight anacoluthon; the whole anecdote rings with the *vox viva*: so **ἄρα** ('as he afterwards explained'), **ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ οἱ κτλ.**

6. **καὶ πρότερον**, 'even before this'; cp. c. 6 *supra*.

7. **παρέσχε** is neuter. **ἀνέσχε**, just below, is of course personal, but intransitive; cp. *Od.* 5. 320 *οὐδ' ἐδυνάσθη αἶψα μάλ' ἀνσχεθέειν μεγάλου ὑπὸ κύματος ὁρμῆς*.

8. **τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν**, coming just after *τότε*, might appear to be spatial rather than temporal; but if taken with **ἔτι** must be vaguely opposed to *καὶ πρότερον* just before. *ἔτι* may be referred (with Stein) to the man's previous unsuccessful attempts (not that any are recorded), or more generally (with Sitzler) to his period of

εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως, θωμάζω δὲ εἰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐστὶ ἀληθέα·
λέγεται γὰρ ὡς ἐξ Ἀ*φετέων δὺς ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν οὐ πρότερον*
ἀνέσχε πρὶν ἢ ἀπίκετο ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀ*ρτεμίσιον, σταδίους μάλιστά*
κῃ τούτους ἐς ὀγδώκοντα διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διεξελθών. λέγεται
μέν νυν καὶ ἄλλα ψευδέσι εἴκελα περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου, τὰ
δὲ μετεξέτερα ἀληθέα· περὶ μέντοι τούτου γνώμη μοι ἀποδε-
δέχθω πλοίῳ μιν ἀπικέσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀ*ρτεμίσιον. ὡς δὲ ἀπίκετο,*
αὐτίκα ἐσήμηνε τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι τήν τε ναυηγίην ὡς γένοιτο,
καὶ τὰς περιπεμφθείσας τῶν νεῶν περὶ Εὔ*βοιαν. τοῦτο δὲ* **9**
ἀκούσαντες οἱ Ἕ*λληνες λόγον σφίσι αὐτοῖσι ἐδίδοσαν. πολλῶν*

---

9 *εἶπαι* **ß**z, van H. || *θωυμάζω* **ß**, Stein[1] 10 *ὡς* om. **ß** 11 *ἀνέχειν* **ß** 12 *τούτους ἐς* om. **ß** 13 *ἴκελλα* RV: *ἴκελα* S, Bekker, van H. 15 *ἀπικέεσθαι* R 16 *ἐσήμαινε* **ß**, Holder 17 *περιπεφθείσας* A[1]B[1] || *νηῶν* **ß**

---

suspense and waiting for a favourable opportunity.

9. **θωμάζω δὲ εἰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐστὶ ἀληθέα,** 'I wonder if the story is true'—a wonder which, if Hdt. had given more way to it, might have flooded his work with shallow rationalism. His critique of the story of Skyllias is poor, for he seems to see no alternative between Skyllias having dived all the way from Aphetai to Artemision and having come all the way in a boat.

11. **σταδίους μάλιστά κῃ τούτους ἐς ὀγδώκοντα.** 80 stades would not cover the whole distance from Aphetai (wherever it be placed) to Artemision, assuming that Artemision is east of Aphetai. But from shore to shore the channel is in places barely 50 stades, and many a swimmer nowadays would make little of it. **τούτους** (omitted by **ß**) is rightly taken by Stein as "appositive"; cp. 3. 5 *ἐὸν τοῦτο οὐκ ὀλίγον χωρίον.*

13. **ἄλλα ψευδέσι εἴκελα,** as perhaps the story told by Pausanias *l.c. infra* of his (and his daughter's) diving down, in the storm off Pelion, and cutting the cables, etc., of the Persian ships. **τὰ δὲ μετεξέτερα ἀληθέα** may be a concession to Delphi, where was a statue, dedicated by the Amphiktyones, of *Σκύλλις* and of his daughter, *Ὕδνα* by name, which Hdt. may have seen (Pausan. 10. 19. 1). If so, this story would not be of the original draft; cp. Introduction, § 9. The dedication attests the reality and importance of the services of Skyllias, whatever they were. **μετεξέτερα** = *ἔνια.*

16. **αὐτίκα ἐσήμηνε τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι:** according to Hdt. Skyllias reported to the Greek admirals (1) the storm, its origin and effects; (2) the despatch of the 200 ships round Euboia. The Greeks knew all about the storm already, *πάντα τὰ γενόμενα περὶ τὴν ναυηγίην*, from their scouts, 7. 192, and they had also, apparently before the arrival of Skyllias, captured fifteen of the enemy's vessels, and closely questioned their prisoners, 7. 194 f. It is possible (with Stein) to emphasize the construction **ὡς γένοιτο** as referring not to the fact, the bare fact of a storm having occurred, but to the course, circumstances, and results of the storm, the extent of the Persian losses, etc. The change or incompleteness of the construction is observable, a limb coordinate with *ὡς γένοιτο* to follow *τὰς περιπεμφθείσας τῶν νεῶν* being conspicuous by its absence, though not grammatically indispensable. Hdt. seems to make the report on the storm (off Pelion) the chief point of Skyllias's communication; while, upon the face of it, his report on the flying squadron was newer and more startling and important tidings for the Greeks. But what did he report of the 200 ships? Simply that they had been despatched? Or that they too had been, must have been, wrecked? (*ὡς νεναυηγήκασι*).

9. 2. **οἱ Ἕλληνες:** sc. *οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων.* On learning the despatch of a squadron round Euboia the Greek admirals held a council of war (*λόγον σφίσι αὐτοῖσι ἐδίδοσαν*). So far the statement may be historical; what follows is

δὲ λεχθέντων ἐνίκα τὴν ἡμέρην ἐκείνην αὐτοῦ μείναντάς τε καὶ αὐλισθέντας, μετέπειτα νύκτα μέσην παρέντας πορεύεσθαι καὶ ἀπαντᾶν τῇσι περιπλεούσῃσι τῶν νεῶν. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο, ὡς οὐδείς σφι ἐπέπλεε, δείλην ὀψίην γινομένην τῆς ἡμέρης

9. 5 περιπλωούσῃσι **B** || τοῦτο del. van H. 6 ἐπέπλωε **B**z, van H. || τῆς ἡμέρης γινομένην S

inconsistent with itself, and unintelligible. The Greeks debate various alternatives (not stated); they decide upon one, and that one an absurdity, a strategic inconceivability; and they proceed to act in defiance of their decision. For obvious reasons the Greeks at Artemision could not abandon that position, so long as Thermopylai was held by Leonidas; they cannot have determined at this point to retreat. Nor was any such move demanded by the Persian *periplous* of Euboia; a few ships would be sufficient to hold the narrow channel at Chalkis, and, if that were held, the fleet at Artemision, the army at Thermopylai, had little to fear from the *periplous*. But a real source of anxiety may have lain in a doubt as to the true objective of the Persian flying squadron. What if the 200 vessels were making, not for Chalkis, but for Oropos, for Phaleron, for the Isthmos? The storm may have reassured the Greeks, convinced that a squadron on the high sea could not weather it, even if Skyllias had reported only the despatch of the Persian vessels. The actual resolution taken by the Greeks is to be inferred from their action; they must have decided to remain, and to attack the Persian fleet, or perhaps the rear-guard thereof. Possibly the account here of the fighting on the 'first' day, resulting in the capture of thirty ships, is an unconscious doublet of the account given in 7. 194 of the capture of the fifteen ships, that being from an Asianic, this from a European source; Kypriotes are concerned in both stories, and it is extremely hard to find room otherwise, in the narrative here, for the episode there recorded; cp. Appendix V. § 4.

3. **ἐνίκα**: of a deliberative decision, 6. 101. This decision might be identical with the one reported in c. 4 *supra*; cp. next note.

τὴν ἡμέρην ἐκείνην: *prima facie* this day witnesses (1) the arrival of the Persian fleet at Aphetai, (2) the arrival of Skyllias at Artemision, (3) the council of war, (4) the first engagement at sea, whether this be, or be not, identical with (5) the capture of the fifteen ships described in 7. 194; to these items must apparently be added (6) the first day's fighting at Thermopylai, and, as Hdt. would have us believe, (7) the despatch of the squadron to circumnavigate Euboia. It is, however, possible that these events are unduly accumulated. The despatch of the squadron to circumnavigate Euboia is, as above shown, to be dated before the Persian fleet passed Skiathos and the *myrmex*, that is, before the storm. The interval (ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ c. 8 *supra*) between the despatch of the squadron and the arrival of Skyllias at Artemision may have comprised not hours, but days; or again, his arrival at Artemision may have anticipated the Persian arrival at Aphetai by some days, and not, as apparently implied by Hdt. here, have succeeded it by some hours. Again, the further chronological indication just below (μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο) is of little or no value, the interval being entirely vague. If Skyllias arrived in the Greek camp before the storm, before the Persians had passed Skiathos, in fact days before the capture of the fifteen Persian vessels, or the first engagements at Artemision and Thermopylai, then, indeed, the Greek admirals may have decided, on the strength of his information, to detach a portion of their own fleet (cp. c. 14 *infra*) to guard, or to reinforce the ships guarding, the Euripos channel, while themselves remaining on the spot (**αὐτοῦ**), as a matter of course, with the larger part, to cover Thermopylai and the northern channel (of Oreos) from the advance of the Persian navy.

6. **δείλην ὀψίην γινομένην τῆς ἡμέρης**: *prima facie* this chronological reference carries back not merely to τὴν ἡμέρην ἐκείνην just above, but to the δείλην πρωίην γινομένην of c. 6 *supra*, the hour of the arrival of the Persians at Aphetai. It is, however, possible that these early and late afternoons are not on the same day. The arrival of the Persian fleet at

φυλάξαντες αὐτοὶ ἐπανέπλεον ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους, ἀπόπειραν αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι βουλόμενοι τῆς τε μάχης καὶ τοῦ διεκπλόου. *ὁρῶντες δὲ σφέας οἵ τε ἄλλοι στρατιῶται οἱ Ξέρξεω καὶ οἱ* **10** *στρατηγοὶ ἐπιπλέοντας νηυσὶ ὀλίγῃσι, πάγχυ σφι μανίην ἐπενείκαντες ἀνῆγον καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰς νέας, ἐλπίσαντες σφέας εὐπετέως αἱρήσειν, οἰκότα κάρτα ἐλπίσαντες, τὰς μέν γε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁρῶντες ὀλίγας νέας, τὰς δὲ ἑωυτῶν πλήθεΐ τε πολλαπλησίας καὶ ἄμεινον πλεούσας· καταφρονήσαντες ταῦτα ἐκυκλοῦντο αὐτοὺς ἐς μέσον. ὅσοι μέν νυν τῶν Ἰώνων ἦσαν*

---

7 ἐπανέπλωον **B**z, van H. 8 διεκπλώου **B** **10.** 1 ὁρέωντες C: ὁρέοντες R, Stein[1], van H.: ὁρέοντος V 2 ἐπιπλώοντας **B**z, van H. 3 ἀνήγαγον **B** || ἐλπίσαντές σφεας Stein[1] 5 ὁρέωντες C: ὁρέοντες **B**, Stein[1], van H. 6 πολλαπλασίας **B**CPz || πλωούσας **B**, van H.

Aphetai, to say nothing of the subsequent numbering, was not to be accomplished in the twinkling of an eye; the only synchronism to which we may cling with desperate tenacity is the coincidence of the three days' fightings at Artemision and at Thermopylai, this being grounded, though not absolutely, in the strategic and tactical necessities of the case. The use of **φυλάξαντες** is made clear in c. 14 *infra*.

Blakesley suggests that the Greeks timed their attack so as to have the sinking sun full in the eyes of the enemy's steersmen; if so, Hdt.'s account will require further revision, for Aphetai is, if anything, west of Artemision.

7. **ἀπόπειραν αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι βουλόμενοι**: verily a laudable curiosity! That Hdt. should solemnly record a decision to retreat (and this the third, cp. c. 4 *supra*, 7. 182) and immediately thereupon an assumption of the offensive by the would-be fugitives, and that out of experimental curiosity, is fatally symptomatic of his military motivation, and must be taken to set the modern reader free to enforce the *Sach-Kritik*, or standard of physical and psychological probability, with considerable boldness.

8. **τῆς τε μάχης καὶ τοῦ διεκπλόου**: with *μάχῃ*, manner of fighting, cp. 5. 49, 7. 9. The *διέκπλοος* was, perhaps, an Ionian device; cp. my note to 6. 12, and c. 11 *infra*.

10. 1. **ὁρῶντες δέ κτλ.** There is a remarkable coincidence between the language (the sentiment also) of this passage and the description of the Persian mind at Marathon, 6. 112 *οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ὁρέοντες* (*sic*) . . *δρόμῳ ἐπιόντας* . . *μανίην τε τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι ἐπέφερον καὶ πάγχυ ὀλεθρίην, ὁρέοντες αὐτοὺς ὀλίγους καὶ τούτους δρόμῳ ἐπειγομένους*. If Stein's readings are correct the Atticism of this passage—the earlier in order of composition, if my theory (Introduction, §§ 7, 8) holds—is the more pronounced: as is natural, on that theory.

4. **οἰκότα κάρτα ἐλπίσαντες**: for two reasons, their ships being more numerous, and better sailers (*ἄμεινον πλεούσας*): a notable admission, perhaps not free from exaggeration, especially under the circumstances, the Persian ships having been so long in the water, even if the storm had not already occurred to damage them. They had, however, perhaps been carefully overhauled at Doriskos, and at Therme.

6. **καταφρονήσαντες ταῦτα**: the verb has not yet acquired its dyslogistic force; cp. 1. 59, 66.

7. **ἐκυκλοῦντο αὐτοὺς ἐς μέσον**, 'they attempted to surround them in a circle' (cp. c. 85 *infra*), and were apparently in the first instance successful. This was a *περίπλοος* of another sort to that conducted by *τῇσι περιπλεούσῃσι τῶν νεῶν* above: could it be that there is some confusion up above in the report of the resolution of the Greeks *ἀπαντᾶν τῇσι περιπλεούσῃσι* to front, or attack, the ships which were surrounding them?

ὅσοι μέν νυν τῶν Ἰώνων: there were, then, some of the Ionians in the Persian ranks well-disposed, loyal (*εὔνοοι*), to the 'Hellenic' cause: an important admission, and indicating a weakness, with which the Persian admirals just before have failed to reckon; cp. 7. 51.

εὔνοοι τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἀέκοντές τε ἐστρατεύοντο, συμφορήν τε ἐποιεῦντο μεγάλην ὁρῶντες περιεχομένους αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπιστάμενοι ὡς οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἀπονοστήσει· οὕτω ἀσθενέα σφι ἐφαίνετο εἶναι τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρήγματα. ὅσοισι δὲ καὶ ἡδομένοισι ἦν τὸ γινόμενον, ἅμιλλαν ἐποιεῦντο ὅκως αὐτὸς ἕκαστος πρῶτος νέα Ἀττικὴν ἑλὼν παρὰ βασιλέος δῶρα λάμψεται· Ἀθηναίων γὰρ αὐτοῖσι λόγος ἦν πλεῖστος ἀνὰ τὰ
11 *στρατόπεδα. τοῖσι δὲ Ἕλλησι ὡς ἐσήμηνε, πρῶτα μὲν ἀντί-*

---

8 *τοῖσι Ἕλλησι, ἀέκοντές* Stein[1 2], edd. plerique : virgulam del. van H., Stein[3] || *ἐστρατεύοντο, συμφορήν* : virgulam exhib. Gaisford, Holder, van H., Stein[3] || *τε* alterum del. van H. 9 *ὁρέωντες* C : *ὁρέοντες* **B** : *ὁρέοντές* <*τε*> van H. 10 *οὐδείς σφιν ἀπονοστήσειν* RS : (*ἀπονοστη.* cum *σ* litt. ult. superscr. V) || *σφιν ἀσθενέα* S 11 *τῶν* om. S 12 *ἐποιέοντο* **B** || *ἕκαστος αὐτὸς* **B** 13 *νῆα* **B** || *βασιλέως* C*d* 14 *λάμψηται* S*z* **11.** 1 *ἀντίπρῳροι* van H., Stein[3] : volgo sine *ι* subscr.

---

9. **περιεχομένους**: imperfect, 'in course of being surrounded': so **τὸ γινόμενον** just below.

ἐπιστάμενοι : the word seems used by Hdt. in reference to the strength rather than the truth of their certitude, not without a touch of irony herein.

11. **πρήγματα** : c. 4 *supra*.

ὅσοισι δέ : sc. *τῶν Ἰώνων* : or was it rather the Dorians, and that set? Artemisia *par exemple* and the Halikarnassians? Or is the reference wider still, covering all the components of the fleet, who were pleased with what was going on, and ambitious, every man of them, to capture an Attic ship and to receive rewards from the king therefor? With the construction cp. *ἀσμένοισι* c. 14 *infra*, *ἡδομένοισι* 9. 46. Blakesley cps. Tacitus *Agric.* 18, *quibus . . bellum volentibus erat.*

14. **Ἀθηναίων γάρ** : the unblushing Atticism of the passage suggests the ultimate source, if not the channel, of these reports. There is some slight inconsequence in the rewards offered for the capture of a Greek, or at least an Attic ship, and the sure and certain confidence of victory; but the rewards are likely to be historical. The Athenians had been victors at Marathon; the Athenians had supported the Ionic revolt; Athenian exiles were on the Persian fleet, or in the king's camp.

ἀνὰ τὰ στρατόπεδα. Stein refers to the navy, and to the Persian navy alone, which was of a composite character. *στρατόπεδον* can certainly denote a naval force, perhaps especially when brought to land (cp. 5. 36), but the mention of the king in the immediate context, and the considerations urged in the previous note, justify the extension of the term here to cover the forces in front of Thermopylai. The phrase thus becomes a homage to the solidarity of the parallel operations.

11. 1. **ἐσήμηνε** : sc. *ὁ σαλπιγκτής* : cp. Aischyl. *Pers.* 395. The Greek manœuvres are proceeding with the utmost coolness and precision; their ships are conglobated, and with their sterns centred on one point (*ἐς τὸ μέσον τὰς πρύμνας συνήγαγον*) : this position is assumed at the first signal, for previously they were rowing forward (*ἐπανέπλεον ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους* c. 9 *supra*); at the second signal (**δεύτερα δὲ σημήναντος**) they shot forwards, although by that time they were surrounded, the *περίπλοος*, the *κύκλωσις* of the enemy's more numerous fleet having now developed itself: the Greek ships charged the enemy bow to bow (*κατὰ στόμα*). This account looks at first sight plausible; reflexion shows it to be deficient. Was the *κύκλωσις* indeed complete? Was the Greek fleet completely surrounded, and the individual vessels radiating from a centre, like spokes from a wheel, all round? Could 271 galleys really be arranged for practical or tactical purposes on such a plan? Or was the formation, perhaps, but in a crescent or arc? And again, were the Persian ships advancing *κατὰ στόμα*, or

πρῳροι τοῖσι βαρβάροισι γενόμενοι ἐς τὸ μέσον τὰς πρύμνας συνήγαγον, δεύτερα δὲ σημήναντος ἔργου εἴχοντο ἐν ὀλίγῳ περ ἀπολαμφθέντες καὶ κατὰ στόμα. ἐνθαῦτα τριήκοντα νέας αἱρέουσι τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ τὸν Γόργου τοῦ Σαλαμινίων βασιλέος ἀδελφεὸν Φιλάονα τὸν Χέρσιος, λόγιμον ἐόντα ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἄνδρα. πρῶτος δὲ Ἑλλήνων νέα τῶν πολεμίων εἷλε ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος Λυκομήδης Αἰσχραίου, καὶ τὸ ἀριστήιον

---

2 *γινόμενοι* **B**Pz 3 *εἰσήγαγον* C 4 *νῆας* **B** 5 *τῶν βαρβάρων* om. **B**, Holder 6 *βασιλέως* C || *ἐν* om. C 7 *ἄνδρα* om. **B**, Holder || *νῆα* **B** : *μετὰ* C 8 *αἰσχραίου* **a**SV : *αἰσχρέου* R et reliqui : *Αἰσχρέω* Bredow, Holder, van H.

---

were they rowing round and round the Greeks in the attempt to compress them into a small space? In the first of the two engagements, afterwards so celebrated, between Phormion and the Peloponnesians, *anno* 429 B.C., the Athenian admiral, with but twenty ships, succeeded in rowing all round a fleet of 47 sail, which the incompetent Knemos had drawn up in a hollow circle, their prows outwards, round their tenders and convoys. If the Peloponnesian ships on that occasion *ἔργου εἴχοντο ἐν ὀλίγῳ περ ἀπολαμφθέντες*, they might have struck Phormion's ships, but not *κατὰ στόμα*, bow to bow, but much more advantageously, amidships or broadside. As it was, the result of Phormion's manœuvre was to compress the fleet of Knemos into an ever-narrowing space, and finally to throw it into complete confusion (Thucyd. 2. 83 f.). But the case here is different. A vastly superior force is encircling an inferior number: possibly in this case the ships advanced *κατὰ στόμα*, prow to prow, albeit ramming on that system was not likely to result in a Greek victory. Hence the suspicion arises that there is something confused and inaccurate in Hdt.'s description of this engagement: the capture of the thirty ships by the Greeks certainly ensues with surprising rapidity. If these thirty ships were cut off in some way from the main fleet, the result would be more intelligible. And again, if the story (in 7. 194) of the capture of fifteen ships, owing to a misunderstanding, be the Asianic version of this first engagement, we have to seek for a *tertium quid*, between that account, which reduces the engagement to a mere contretemps, and this account, which magnifies it into a pitched battle and a glorious victory, as the real event.

4. **κατὰ στόμα**: *ex adverso*, *a fronte*, Baehr; *Bug gegen Bug*, Stein, which seems better than his first idea, *und zwar nur von vorn.*

τριήκοντα: just twice as many as the Asianic tradition (7. 194) allows.

6. **Φιλάονα**: on Philaon and his family cp. note to 7. 98. In the fifteen ships was captured the Paphian Penthylos (7. 195), as well as Sandokes and Aridolis.

7. **στρατοπέδῳ**: doubtless the fleet, or naval force; cp. c. 10 *supra.*

8. **Λυκομήδης Αἰσχραίου**: Plutarch, *Themist.* 15, transfers the exploit to Salamis, which contradicts c. 84 *infra*, but at any rate suggests other possible transferences: *πρῶτος μὲν οὖν λαμβάνει ναῦν Λυκομήδης ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος τριηραρχῶν, ἧς τὰ παράσημα περικόψας, ἀνέθηκεν Ἀπόλλωνι δαφνηφόρῳ Φλυῆσιν.* The last word may be a gloss (cp. Bauer, *Plutarchs Themistokles*, 1884, p. 56); but was not Lykomedes a member of the clan (*γένος*) of the Lykomidai, to which Themistokles certainly belonged (cp. Plutarch, *op. cit.* 1)? The names *Αἰσχραῖος*, *Αἰσχρίων*, *Αἴσχρων* are all epigraphically attested for Athens (cp. Pauly-Wissowa, i. 1063 f.), while *Αἰσχριωνίη* appears 3. 26 as the name of a *φυλή* in Samos. A Lykomedes of Phlye appears on an inscription of 418–17 B.C. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*[1], 38; Hicks, *Manual*[2], 70 [53]. He might be grandson of the one here in the text.

τὸ ἀριστήιον ἔλαβε οὗτος. The *Aristeion* is a definite award (cp. c. 93, 9. 71, 105), and this notice may be historical; yet in view of Plutarch's statement, touching *τὰ παράσημα*, a sus-

ἔλαβε οὗτος. τοὺς δ' ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίῃ ταύτῃ ἑτεραλκέως ἀγωνιζομένους νὺξ ἐπελθοῦσα διέλυσε. οἱ μὲν δὴ Ἕλληνες ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἀπέπλεον, οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι ἐς τὰς Ἀφέτας, πολλὸν παρὰ δόξαν ἀγωνισάμενοι. ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ναυμαχίῃ Ἀντίδωρος Λήμνιος μοῦνος τῶν σὺν βασιλέι Ἑλλήνων ἐόντων αὐτομολέει ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον ἔδοσαν αὐτῷ χῶρον ἐν Σαλαμῖνι.

12 Ὡς δὲ εὐφρόνη ἐγεγόνεε, ἦν μὲν τῆς ὥρης μέσον θέρος, ἐγίνετο δὲ ὕδωρ τε ἄπλετον διὰ πάσης τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ σκληραὶ βρονταὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πηλίου· οἱ δὲ νεκροὶ καὶ τὰ ναυήγια ἐξεφέροντο

---

9 *τοὺς δὲ* CR || *ἐν* om. C 10 *διέλυε* C 11 *ἀπέπλωον* RS, van H. 15 *αὐτῷ* om. **B**, Holder, van H. || *χώραν* **B** 12. 2 *ἄπλετόν τε* **B** || *βρονταὶ σκληραὶ* Pdz 3 *ναυάγια* B || *ἐξεφερέοντο* Holder, van H.

---

picion suggests itself of some possible confusion.

9. **ἑτεραλκέως ἀγωνιζομένους**: cp. 9. 103 *ὡς εἶδον αὐτίκα κατ' ἀρχὰς γινομένην ἑτεραλκέα τὴν μάχην*. The word is taken to mean in Hdt. 'doubtful,' *ancipiti Marte*, though it is an Homeric word, and the Homeric meaning is 'decisive.' An engagement in which one side loses thirty triremes to the other is hardly indecisive, or of doubtful issue; and the barbarians return to Aphetai *πολλὸν παρὰ δόξαν ἀγωνισάμενοι*.

10. **νύξ**: simply prosaic and depersonified. The movements resulting in the engagement had started late in the afternoon; cp. c. 10 *supra*.

13. **Ἀντίδωρος Λήμνιος.** The name Antidoros is epigraphically attested for Athens in the fourth century B.C. (Pauly-Wissowa, i. 2397, where this Lemnian does not appear at all). The island of Lemnos was claimed for Athens in virtue of the act of Miltiades (cp. 6. 137–140), and as the Athenians recovered possession within a few years (cp. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* III. i. 414 f.), it is, perhaps, doubly remarkable that they settled this 'Lemnian' in Salamis rather than in his native place. His exact status in Lemnos, in Salamis, and in Athens, is not quite clear. Was he an Athenian citizen? Had he been so all along? Had he been a citizen and forfeited his rights? Salamis was not a 'deme,' and never appears as such: the Athenian settlers were technically 'Kleruchs'; but there were doubtless natives also, and the possession of a *χῶρος ἐν Σαλαμῖνι* probably did not carry with it full citizenship. The word *κλῆρος* here would have been less embarrassing.

12. 1. **εὐφρόνη**: cp. c. 6 *supra*; the word appears to be used without any eulogistic intention. The pluperfect, **ἐγεγόνεε**, is used perhaps to avoid clashing with *ἐγίνετο* just below. **ἦν μέν**, 'though the season (*ὥρη*) was midsummer, yet' (**δέ**). With the date cp. 7. 206. **ἄπλετος**, as in 1. 14 (*χρυσός*), 4. 53 (*ἅλες*), 6. 58 (*οἰμωγή*), etc., 'boundless,' 'no end of,' 'galore.' **σκληραί** (*bis*) of the *βρονταί* denotes perhaps the sharp rattle of thunder in close proximity; L. & S. cp. Vergil's *aridus fragor*, *G.* i. 357 f.

3. **ἀπὸ τοῦ Πηλίου**: i.e. from the north, behind them, the scene of the great storm in Bk. 7. 188 ff., if, indeed, the two storms be not all one. But is the phrase here purely locative or quite void of a suggestion of causality and generation? (Cp. *τὸ ἀπὸ Ξέρξου* c. 15 *infra*.)

τὰ ναυήγια: are these wrecks, with the corpses, the product of the storm itself or of the antecedent battle?

ἐξεφέροντο ἐς τὰς Ἀφέτας. The wreckage and corpses were thrown ashore on the strand at Aphetai: how was that, if the storm was from Pelion? Was it the result of the tide and the current, or were they carried by a wind moving against the thunderstorm? In any case it is hardly safe to press this statement into a proof that there was a great storm from the south immediately in succession to the three days' storm from the north, or north-east (in Bk. 7),

ἐς τὰς Ἀφέτας, καὶ περί τε τὰς πρῴρας τῶν νεῶν εἱλέοντο καὶ ἐτάρασσον τοὺς ταρσοὺς τῶν κωπέων. οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται οἱ ταύτῃ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα ἐς φόβον κατιστέατο, ἐλπίζοντες πάγχυ ἀπολέεσθαι ἐς οἷα κακὰ ἧκον· πρὶν γὰρ ἢ καὶ ἀναπνεῦσαι σφέας ἔκ τε τῆς ναυηγίης καὶ τοῦ χειμῶνος τοῦ γενομένου κατὰ Πήλιον, ὑπέλαβε ναυμαχίη καρτερή, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ναυμαχίης ὄμβρος τε λάβρος καὶ ῥεύματα ἰσχυρὰ ἐς θάλασσαν ὁρμημένα βρονταί τε σκληραί. καὶ τούτοισι μὲν τοιαύτη ἡ νὺξ ἐγίνετο, **13** *τοῖσι δὲ ταχθεῖσι αὐτῶν περιπλέειν Εὔβοιαν ἡ αὐτή περ ἐοῦσα νὺξ πολλὸν ἦν ἔτι ἀγριωτέρη, τοσούτῳ ὅσῳ ἐν πελάγεϊ φερο-*

4 *πρῴρας* van H., Stein[3]: volgo sine *ι* subscr. || *καὶ τῶν* B || *εἱλέοντο* van H., Stein[3]: *εἰλέοντο* 5 *ἀπάρασσον* Emperius, van H. 7 *ἀπολέσθαι* **β**: *ἀπολεῖσθαι* van H. || *ἐς* om. C || *ἢ* om. R 8 *γινομένου* **β** 9 *καρτερὴ* SP*dz*: *κρατερὴ* ceteri 10 *τε* om. **β** || *λάβρος* **α**: *λάμβρος* C: *καρτερὸς* **β** || *ἐς*: *κατὰ* CP*z* || *ὡρμημένα* CP*dz* **13.** 1 <*ἡ*>*νὺξ* Schaefer, Stein[2 3]: *νὺξ* 2 *αὐτέων* **α** || *περιπλώειν* **β***z*, van H.

a somewhat improbable sequence. Hdt. says nothing here about the wind, which first makes its appearance on the 'high sea,' in the next chapter, as though the men at Aphetai had not been exposed to it. In this chapter what the Persians suffer from is rain, thunders (and lightnings), and all that at night. The ships apparently were not beached but in the water, otherwise the corpses could hardly have been rolling over round the prows (which slowly move through the mass of wreckage and dead bodies), much less have been interfering with the blades of the oars (*τοὺς ταρσοὺς τῶν κωπέων*). This description, indeed, suggests rather the position off the Magnesian coast, where the ships spent the night at sea, than the situation at Aphetai, to which the Persians have retired in the previous chapter.

5. **οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται οἱ ταύτῃ**: a rather mysterious designation: who are 'the soldiers, or fighting men, in the place'? Are they the *epibatai* of the fleet? Are they the Persians in Malis? Are they a corps of Persians still in Thessaly, and in more immediate touch with the fleet? Whoever they are, they seem to be ashore, while the ships and the oarsmen are still afloat.

6. **ἀκούοντες ταῦτα**: hearing what? news of the disaster? Or, more directly, the thunder and the rain? the wreckage and the corpses? Or is *ἀκούοντες* used (like *ταῦτα*) in a vaguer and more extended reference = perceiving? The disappointment of the day (*πολλὸν παρὰ δόξαν ἀγωνισάμενοι* c. 11) is followed by a scare, a panic, at night, when they expect (*ἐλπίζοντες*) to be destroyed utterly, *ὅτι ἐς τοιαῦτα κακὰ ἧκον*, such was the evil plight which had befallen them.

7. **ἀναπνεῦσαι**, to recover breath. **ἐκ**, out of, after. The attitude here indicated is hardly consistent with the ideas and expectations ascribed to them in c. 10 *supra*.

9. **ὑπέλαβε ναυμαχίη καρτερή**: so much for the Greek experiment of c. 9. The *ἀπόπειρα* has become a *ν. καρτερή*. *ὑπολαβεῖν*, to succeed, to come on, to overtake; generally of disasters; cp. 6. 27 (*bis*: *λοιμός· ναυμαχίη*).

10. **ὁρμημένα** is noticeable, the verb being seldom used in a really passive sense, or of merely inanimate objects.

13. 1. **τούτοισι μέν**: rather vague; hardly to be referred strictly to *οἱ στρατιῶται οἱ ταύτῃ* above; rather more generally to the whole *στρατόπεδον* at Aphetai; still more general is the **αὐτῶν** immediately following (cp. Index).

2. **τοῖσι δὲ ταχθεῖσι**: cp. c. 7 *supra*.

ἡ αὐτή περ ἐοῦσα νὺξ πολλὸν ἦν ἔτι ἀγριωτέρη: a somewhat quaint and helpless turn, especially followed by *ἐπέπιπτε*, all the more as *νύξ* does not appear to be personified. For **ἄχαρις** cp. 7. 190, etc. **πέλαγος** is here of great significance; cp. next two notes.

μένοισι ἐπέπιπτε, καὶ τὸ τέλος σφι ἐγίνετο ἄχαρι. ὡς γὰρ δὴ πλέουσι αὐτοῖσι χειμών τε καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπεγίνετο ἐοῦσι κατὰ τὰ Κοῖλα τῆς Εὐβοίης, φερόμενοι τῷ πνεύματι καὶ οὐκ εἰδότες τῇ ἐφέροντο ἐξέπιπτον πρὸς τὰς πέτρας· ἐποιέετό τε πᾶν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὅκως ἂν ἐξισωθείη τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ τὸ

---

4 τὸ om. **B** || ἐγένετο **B**, Holder 5 πλώουσι(ν V) **B**, van H. || <ὁ>χειμών van H. || τὸ om. *d* 7 ἐξεφέροντο **B** || ἐς τὰς S(V) 8 τοῦ om. *z* || ἐξισωθῇ C || τὸ περιεὸν **B**, Valla

---

5. **χειμών τε καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ**: '*the* rain' is that already described in c. 12; the thunder is apparently not within hearing, but a 'storm' (*χειμών, πνεῦμα*) is blowing on the high seas.

6. **κατὰ τὰ Κοῖλα τῆς Εὐβοίης**, 'off the Hollows of Euboia'; cp. *περί* next chapter, when the ships are dashed ashore, and cp. c. 7 *supra*. As Rawlinson remarks, it is not perfectly certain what exact reach of Euboian coast is denoted by 'the Hollows.' Strabo, 445, makes it the tract between Geraistos and the Euripos: *τῆς Εὐβοίας τὰ Κοῖλα λέγουσι τὰ μεταξὺ Αὐλίδος καὶ τῶν περὶ Γεραιστὸν τόπων· κολποῦται γὰρ ἡ παραλία.* The statement would have been more convincing if the reason had not been added, for the outer coast of Euboia, facing the high sea, is also hollowed (in contrast, for example, with the Magnesian coast), even if not sculptured into such a remarkable series of bays as the Paralia from Geraistos to Chalkis. The Epitomator of Strabo places the Hollows between Geraistos and Kaphereus, a location preferred by Leake (*Demi* 247); but the absence of the requisite physical features to justify such a nomenclature is fatal to this identification. Not so the extension of the term to the Paralia between Kaphereus and the promontory Chersonnesos—a coast the general trend of which is more truly concave than the line of coast west of Geraistos, which is, in fact, a convex, broken by a series of superficial recesses or cavities. Possibly the term 'Hollows' was applied to the whole of the southern scimitar-shaped section of Euboia, and so ships wrecked on either side might be said to have come to grief on or off the Hollows. But if Strabo is right in restricting the term as above explained, and that not merely for his own day, in that case Hdt. is almost certainly wrong in making the Persian ships pass Geraistos. They would hardly then have been *ἐν πελάγεϊ*, and to wreck them there we must conjure up an improbable storm from the south or west in the teeth of the Hellespontias and Boreas which have been raging (at most a day or two before) off Pelion. The ships in Hdt. (*pace* Strabo) must have been wrecked long before they rounded Geraistos, or even Kaphereus, for they are wrecked during the night following the day upon which they have been despatched. As above shown the squadron of 200 sail, detached to circumnavigate Euboia, was really detached from the main fleet off the Magnesian coast on the day or evening before the great storm, and passing 'outside Skiathos' rowed south a whole quiet midsummer's night (7. 188) before being overtaken by the great storm. Hdt. has apparently duplicated the storm, the more easily as the stories there and here are from different sources: his chronology, as well as the causal sequence, being dislocated thereby.

7. **ἐποιέετό τε πᾶν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ**, 'everything was being done by the god'—of thunder, rain, and wind; probably Zeus, rather than Boreas, to whom the Athenians had prayed (7. 189), or the Anemoi, or Anemos, invoked by the Hellenes (7. 178).

8. **ὅκως ἂν . . εἴη**. For the construction cp. *ὡς ἂν μὴ ὀφθείησαν* c. 7 *supra*. The intention of the god was not, however, effected, if we are to credit Hdt. himself, c. 66 *infra*; in other words, Hdt., at different moments, in different contexts, following different sources, thinks nothing of such self-contradictions or inconsequences. The further question emerges: were the numbers of the Persian fleet at Artemision, at Salamis, after all, very much in excess of the Greek? Perhaps not! as seems hinted, admitted, in this curious passage, even though Herodotus

Περσικὸν μηδὲ πολλῷ πλέον εἴη. οὗτοι μέν νυν περὶ τὰ Κοῖλα τῆς Εὐβοίης διεφθείροντο· οἱ δ' ἐν Ἀφέτῃσι βάρβαροι, **14** *ὥς σφι ἀσμένοισι ἡμέρη ἐπέλαμψε, ἀτρέμας τε εἶχον τὰς νέας καί σφι ἀπεχρᾶτο κακῶς πρήσσουσι ἡσυχίην ἄγειν ἐν τῷ παρεόντι. τοῖσι δὲ Ἕλλησι ἐπεβοήθεον νέες πεντήκοντα καὶ τρεῖς Ἀττικαί. αὗταί τε δή σφεας ἐπέρρωσαν ἀπικόμεναι καὶ ἅμα ἀγγελίη ἐλθοῦσα, ὡς τῶν βαρβάρων οἱ περιπλέοντες τὴν Εὔβοιαν πάντες εἴησαν διεφθαρμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ γενομένου χειμῶνος. φυλάξαντες δὴ τὴν αὐτὴν ὥρην, πλέοντες ἐπέπεσον νηυσὶ Κιλίσσῃσι· ταύτας δὲ διαφθείραντες, ὡς εὐφρόνη ἐγίνετο, ἀπέπλεον ὀπίσω ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον.*

---

14. 2 *οἱ δὲ* **B**, Holder 3 *ἀτρέμας* **B***z*: *ἀτρέμα* || *τὰς νέας* abesse velim 4 *ἀπεχρέετο* **B***z*: *ἀπεχρῆτο* ceteri 5 *ἐπεβώθεον* **B**, van H. || *νῆες* **B** || *τρεῖς καὶ πεντήκοντα* **B**, Holder, Stein[1 2], van H. 7 *περιπλώοντες* **B**, van H. 9 *δὲ* **a** || *πλώοντες* **B***z*, van H. 10 *ἔπεσον* R 11 *ἐγένετο* **B**, Stein[1] || *ἀπέπλωον* **B***z*, van H.

---

himself retracts the admission in c. 66. The *Deus ex machina*, here something of a sporting character, is for making it a fair match twixt Greek and Persian! Verily, a trivial Providence. Hdt. lacks logic, whether that of piety or that of philosophy, and is neither very devout nor rational. Cato, the Stoic, went as far as any man in another direction when he excused his opposition to the motion for a *supplicatio* in Cicero's honour: such a solemnity would seem to imply (said he) that Mark's victory was more Heaven's doing than his own: a simple vote of thanks puts the human hero in his proper place; Cicero, *Epp. ad F.* 15. 5.

14. 3. **ἀσμένοισι ἡμέρη ἐπέλαμψε**: on the construction cp. c. 10 *supra*. This day is the 'second' of the *triduum*—say Monday. The present in **κακῶς πρήσσουσι** is a little remarkable, but may denote the effects of the defeat on the previous day, and the inconveniences and terrors of the past night.

5. **ἐπεβοήθεον νέες . . Ἀττικαί.** With these 53 ships the Attic squadron is raised to 180, or even 200 sail. It is natural to surmise that this detachment had been holding the Euripos, whether left there by the main fleet on its way north or sent back to bar the channel, as the result of deliberations at Artemision (cp. c. 4 *supra*). Nor need we suppose that Chalkis was left entirely without guardships; perhaps the twenty vessels manned by the Chalkidians (c. 1 *supra*) were there all the time.

7. **ἅμα ἀγγελίη ἐλθοῦσα**: the adverb qualifies *ἐπέρρωσαν* rather than *ἐλθοῦσα*: Hdt. plainly does not suspect that just the Attic reinforcement brought the good news from Chalkis, or Geraistos, to Artemision. Nor could it have done so, if the Persian ships had been wrecked on the south-west coast of Euboia the night before; the news could hardly have travelled so far and fast. Hdt. marks a coincidence—the arrival of this message so early confirms the view that the Persian squadron of 200 had been wrecked off the east coast of Euboia. But is the message correctly dated? Was it on the second day of the fighting that the Greeks learnt of this fresh disaster to the Persians? Had not the wreck occurred three days ago? Had Skyllias already brought the news? Cp. c. 8 *supra*.

8. **ὑπὸ τοῦ γενομένου χειμῶνος.** Though Hdt. speaks, or seems to speak, in 7. 192 of the storm off the Magnesian coast as *ὁ χειμὼν ὁ πρῶτος*, he nowhere speaks of the storm off Euboia as *ὁ χειμὼν ὁ δεύτερος*. But cp. note *ad l.c.*

9. **φυλάξαντες δὴ τὴν αὐτὴν ὥρην**: cp. c. 9 *supra δείλην ὀψίην γινομένην τῆς ἡμέρης φυλάξαντες*. The use of the word *ὥρη* here comes very near to our 'hour'; not as *τῆς ὥρης* c. 12 *supra*. But why the Greeks, reinforced and encouraged, after a victory too the previous day,

15 Τρίτῃ δὲ ἡμέρῃ δεινόν τι ποιησάμενοι οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων νέας οὕτω σφι ὀλίγας λυμαίνεσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ Ξέρξεω δειμαίνοντες, οὐκ ἀνέμειναν ἔτι τοὺς Ἕλληνας μάχης ἄρξαι, ἀλλὰ παρακελευσάμενοι κατὰ μέσον ἡμέρης ἀνῆγον τὰς νέας. συνέπιπτε δὲ ὥστε τὰς αὐτὰς ἡμέρας τάς τε ναυμαχίας γίνεσθαι ταύτας καὶ τὰς πεζομαχίας τὰς ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι. ἦν δὲ πᾶς ὁ ἀγὼν τοῖσι κατὰ θάλασσαν περὶ τοῦ Εὐρίπου, ὥσπερ τοῖσι ἀμφὶ Λεωνίδην τὴν ἐσβολὴν φυλάσσειν. οἱ μὲν δὴ παρεκελεύοντο ὅκως μὴ παρήσουσι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τοὺς

15. 1 τι : τε? Kallenberg 2 νῆας **B** ‖ σφέας **B** 4 παρασκευασάμενοι **B** ‖ ἀνήγαγον τὰς νῆας **B** 5 τὰς αὐτὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας (R, Stein[1]) **B** : (τὰς αὐτὰς ἡμέρας R, Stein[2]) : ταῖς αὐταῖς ἡμέραις **a** etc. probante Cobet ‖ τε om. **a** 8 λεωνίδεα **B**Pz 9 παρήσωσι(ν V) **B**

should have waited again until late afternoon before delivering an attack, is not clear. Possibly the 'Kilikian' vessels (100 strong originally, 7. 91), on which they 'fell,' were only now coming to Aphetai for the first time.

15. 1. **τρίτῃ δὲ ἡμέρῃ**, 'on the third day' (say Tuesday); the article omitted with the ordinal. **δεινὸν ποιέεσθαι**: cp. 7. 1. **τι**, if correct, aggravates *δεινόν*.

οἱ στρατηγοί: Achaimenes, Ariabignes, Prexaspes, Megabazos; cp. 7. 97, 236. But who was in command of the flying squadron?

2. **τὸ ἀπὸ Ξέρξεω**: an admirable vagueness invests the phrase with all the more serious possibilities. But they were probably acting under the king's orders.

3. **ἔτι**: any further, as on the two days previous, when the Greeks had been left to take the initiative; a fact which supports the view that the real assault on Thermopylai was postponed till 'the third day'; and that the two engagements at sea, on the first and on the second afternoons, were little more than manœuvres, by which the Greeks cut off straggling or belated squadrons of the Persian fleet. With the news of the wreck of the 200 vessels off Euboia the Persian admirals were driven to attempt a frontal attack. They opened, about the time when Hydarnes was descending the mountain, upon 'the Middle Gate' at Thermopylai; cp. 7. 225.

4. On **μέσον ἡμέρης** cp. c. 23 *infra*.

5. **συνέπιπτε δὲ ὥστε κτλ.** Hdt. apparently treats this essential synchronism as purely fortuitous. He follows up this oversight by the misconception that the whole and sole object of the Greek fleet was to defend the Euripos, as that of Leonidas to hold the pass. Every one can now see that the Greeks at Artemision were covering Leonidas, and that Leonidas was making it possible, yea, necessary, for the fleet to remain at Artemision. On which of the two correlated points the Greeks desired the more stress to be laid is a further question, less easy of solution; perhaps they were not quite at one on this matter. So much is clear, that a really decisive victory off Artemision might have saved Thermopylai and Athens to boot. On the first two days, according to their own account, the Greek sea-dogs assumed the offensive (though late in the afternoon!), and won two victories; but on the third day, when the Persian admirals are earlier on the move, it is the turn of the Greeks *ἀτρέμας ἔχειν*. The manœuvres of this day reproduce to a great extent the manœuvres reported c. 11 *supra* of the first engagement (*ναυμαχίῃ καρτέρῃ*), or, more probably, the really severe engagement on the third day has been discounted and transferred, *in maiorem gloriam Atheniensium*, to the first.

9. **παρεκελεύοντο**: there is a *παρακέλευσις* on each side, marking this day's engagement as the climax and the chief battle. Is a set speech (*παραίνεσις*) or mere casual exhortation to be understood?

ὅκως μὴ παρήσουσι seems rather to introduce the purpose or result of the appeals than their actual contents or substance, which the infinitive (with-

βαρβάρους, οἳ δ' ὅκως τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν στράτευμα διαφθείραντες
τοῦ πόρου κρατήσουσι. ὡς δὲ ταξάμενοι οἱ Ξέρξεω ἐπέπλεον, **16**
οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀτρέμας εἶχον πρὸς τῷ Ἀρτεμισίῳ. οἱ δὲ
βάρβαροι μηνοειδὲς ποιήσαντες τῶν νεῶν ἐκυκλοῦντο, ὡς
περιλάβοιεν αὐτούς. ἐνθεῦτεν οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐπανέπλεόν τε καὶ
συνέμισγον. ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ναυμαχίῃ παραπλήσιοι ἀλλήλοισι
ἐγίνοντο. ὁ γὰρ Ξέρξεω στρατὸς ὑπὸ μεγάθεός τε καὶ πλήθεος
αὐτὸς ὑπ' ἑωυτοῦ ἔπιπτε, ταρασσομενέων τε τῶν νεῶν καὶ
περιπιπτουσέων περὶ ἀλλήλας· ὅμως μέντοι ἀντεῖχε καὶ οὐκ
εἶκε· δεινὸν γὰρ χρῆμα ἐποιεῦντο ὑπὸ νεῶν ὀλιγέων ἐς φυγὴν
τράπεσθαι. πολλαὶ μὲν δὴ τῶν Ἑλλήνων νέες διεφθείροντο
πολλοὶ δὲ ἄνδρες, πολλῷ δ' ἔτι πλεῦνες νέες τε τῶν βαρβάρων
καὶ ἄνδρες. οὕτω δὲ ἀγωνιζόμενοι διέστησαν χωρὶς ἑκάτεροι.
ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ναυμαχίῃ Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν τῶν Ξέρξεω στρατιωτέων **17**

---

10 δὲ **B** 11 *κρατήσουσι* P : *κρατήσωσι(ν* S) reliqui **16.** 1 *ἐπέπλωον* **B***z* 3 *νηῶν* **B** ‖ *ἐκυκλοῦντο* Stein[2 3], van H. : *ἐκυκλεῦντο* Reiske, Stein[1], Holder : *ἐκυκλέοντο* **B** : *ἐκυκλεύοντο* **a** etc. 5 *συνέσμιγον* A 6 *ἐγένοντο* **B***z* 7 *ταρασσομένων* A*d* : *παραταττομένων* B ‖ *νηῶν* **B** 9 *χρῆμα* del. van H. ‖ *ἐποιέοντο* **B**P*z* ‖ *ὀλίγων* codd. *z*, Holder, van H. ‖ *φυγεῖν* B 10 *τραπέσθαι* codd. *z* ‖ *νέες* om. A[1] : *νῆες* **B** 11 *δὲ* : *τε* **B** 12 *ἀγωνισάμενοι* Schweighaeuser, van H.

---

out the final conjunction) might express; cp. App. Crit. Most MSS. have *κρατήσωσι infra*.

11. **τοῦ πόρου** here clearly means the actual waterway; cp. 7. 36.

16. 1. **ταξάμενοι**, 'having put themselves in battle-array.' **οἱ Ξέρξεω** (unconsciously) suggests the presence of his majesty, who thus preserves in this, as in the previous chapter, the sovran power and command.

3. **μηνοειδὲς . . ἐκυκλοῦντο**: cp. c. 10 *supra ἐκυκλοῦντο αὐτοὺς ἐς μέσον*. The manœuvres are apparently identical.

4. **ἐπανέπλεον**: just as on the first day (c. 9 *supra*), after all, without waiting to be actually attacked; cp. c. 11 *supra*.

5. **παραπλήσιοι ἀλλήλοισι ἐγίνοντο.** This phrase cannot mean that the Greeks and Persians had equal forces engaged (as a result of the efforts of the *Deus ex machina* of c. 13 *supra*), for Hdt. goes on at once to admit that *μέγαθος* and *πλῆθος* were both conspicuous on the side of the king's fleet (*στρατός*). But if the forces were still unequal, 'they came to be on an equality,' because the *μέγαθος* and the *πλῆθος* turned rather to the disadvantage of the barbarians, as Hdt. explains. The obvious tendency of the passage is apologetic, and apologetic in the Greek interest, for in view of their derring deeds of the two previous days (and, it might be added, in view of the sequel at Salamis), surely a crowning victory was now to have been expected. No such victory could be claimed for Artemision; but with great subtilty the argument is converted into an explanation of the failure of the larger and more numerous force to effect the complete discomfiture of the smaller! (This view seems better than to see in this passage the intention of an Asianic source to explain the failure of the king's fleet.)

7. **αὐτὸς ὑπ' ἑωυτοῦ ἔπιπτε**: a formula afterwards enlarged and converted into the chief rationale of the Persian failure in the whole war; cp. Thucyd. 1. 69. 5.

8. **ἀντεῖχε καὶ οὐκ εἶκε**: an unfortunate jingle. **δεινὸν χρῆμα ἐποιεῦντο**: cp. c. 15 *supra*. The plain truth is that the Persian fleet did not give way, notwithstanding its cumbrous size and numbers, but inflicted very heavy losses upon the Greek. The tense in *ἀγωνιζόμενοι* is remarkable; cp. *πρήσσουσι* in c. 14, and App. Crit. **χωρίς** is pleonastic.

17. 1. **Αἰγύπτιοι.** It is curious that

ἠρίστευσαν, οἳ ἄλλα τε μεγάλα ἔργα ἀπεδέξαντο καὶ νέας αὐτοῖσι ἀνδράσι εἷλον Ἑλληνίδας πέντε. τῶν δὲ Ἑλλήνων κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην ἠρίστευσαν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ἀθηναίων Κλεινίης ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδεω, ὃς δαπάνην οἰκηίην παρεχόμενος ἐστρατεύετο ἀνδράσι τε διηκοσίοισι καὶ οἰκηίῃ νηί.

18 *Ὡς δὲ διέστησαν, ἄσμενοι ἑκάτεροι ἐς ὅρμον ἠπείγοντο.*

---

17. 2 *ἔργα μεγάλα* **B**, Holder, van H. || *νῆας* **B** 5 *κλεινίας* **a** || *οἰκίην* C **18.** 1 *οἱ δὲ ὡς διέστασαν* **B**

---

the 'Egyptians' of all peoples should most have distinguished themselves in a sea-fight: perhaps the Egyptian *Aristeia* was a compliment to their Persian admiral Achaimenes (cp. 7. 236), or that special account was taken of their prejudices and inexperience! Diodoros 11. 13. 2 awards the prize (with more probability) to the Sidonians (perhaps from Hdt. 7. 44).

στρατιωτέων: cp. c. 12 *supra*. The five ships taken, men and all (*αὐτοῖσι ἀνδράσι*), were presumably not Athenian, notwithstanding c. 10 *supra*, or the Athenians could hardly have obtained the *ἀριστεῖα* on this day among the Greeks. Cp. Plutarch *de malig. Hdti.* 34 = *Mor.* 867 *ὁ μὲν Πίνδαρος, οὐκ ὢν συμμάχου πόλεως, ἀλλὰ μηδίζειν αἰτίαν ἐχούσης, ὅμως τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου μνησθεὶς ἐπιπεφώνηκεν, ὅθι παῖδες Ἀθαναίων ἐβάλοντο φαεννὰν κρηπῖδ' ἐλευθερίας.* There are three other citations of the same Pindaric laud in Plutarch's works, viz. *Themist.* 8; *de glor. Ath.* 7 = *Mor.* 350; *de s. num. v.* 6 = *Mor.* 552 C.

5. **Κλεινίης ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδεω.** This Kleinias, son of Alkibiades, is, of course, the father of that better known Alkibiades, the pupil of Sokrates, and the author of so much woe to Athens from 421 B.C. onwards. The name 'Alkibiades' is probably rather a Spartan than an Athenian favourite (cp. Thuc. 8. 6. 3), and the elder Alkibiades, a member of the great clan of the Eurysakidai (Petersen, *Hist. Gent. Att.* 1880, p. 126), or rather of the *Εὐπατρίδαι* (cp. Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie*, 1889, pp. 175 ff.), had been at one time Spartan *πρόξενος* in Athens, but had renounced the office (Thuc. 5. 43. 2), perhaps in consequence of his relations with Kleisthenes and the Alkmaionidai, a daughter of which house, Deinarete by name, he espoused, Alkibiades the younger, their offspring, being thus related to Perikles the son of Agariste (6. 131) on the spindle side. The elder Alkibiades had probably (with Aristeides, Xanthippos, and others) opposed the naval policy of Themistokles, and had suffered ostracism (see Appendix III. § 4), but, if still alive, would have returned with Aristeides (cp. c. 79 *infra*): that his son Kleinias here defrays the expenses, and more than all the expenses of a *τριηραρχία*, seems to show that the father was no longer alive in 480 B.C. (or that the son had an independent fortune?). A further question arises whether the said Kleinias was alive or dead when this passage was written by Hdt. But alas! this passage is consistent with either alternative, and cannot be used as conclusive of the date of composition. Kleinias fell in the disastrous battle of Koroneia in 447 B.C. (Plutarch, *Alkib.* 1), and the fact that his death is not here mentioned might be taken to prove that this passage was originally written during his lifetime (cp. *per contra* the case of Sophanes 9. 75); but, on the other hand, (i.) this record might well have been taken from a sepulchral monument; (ii.) the disaster at Koroneia might better be passed over in silence; (iii.) Hdt. might easily have inserted a reference, had he wished to do so, in the final revision of his work; (iv.) he has not always recorded the deaths of eminent men, his *dramatis personae*, e.g. Aristeides, Themistokles, Xanthippos, and others.

δαπάνην οἰκηίην· οἰκηίῃ νηί: cp. 5. 47 for a parallel instance. At Athens, in Hdt.'s time, the state provided the 'trierarch' with the hull, mast, pay and rations for the men. On the trierarchy cp. Appendix III. § 4.

18. 1. **διέστησαν**: without the superfluous *χωρὶς* of c. 17 *supra*. This day had begun, as it ends, with joy, on both sides! cp. c. 14 *supra*. Stein cps.

οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ὡς διακριθέντες ἐκ τῆς ναυμαχίης ἀπηλ-
λάχθησαν, τῶν μὲν νεκρῶν καὶ τῶν ναυηγίων ἐπεκράτεον,
τρηχέως δὲ περιεφθέντες, καὶ οὐκ ἥκιστα Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν αἱ
ἡμίσεαι τῶν νεῶν τετρωμέναι ἦσαν, δρησμὸν δὴ ἐβούλευον
ἔσω ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. νόῳ δὲ λαβὼν ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης ὡς εἰ 19

2 *ἀπαλλάχθησαν?* van H. 3 *ναυγίων* R: *ναυηγέων* S: *ναυηγιέων* V 4 *τρηχέος* R: *τρίχεως* V 5 *ἡμίσεαι* z: *ἡμίσειαι* **a**P*d*: *ἡμίσεε* C: *ἡμίσεες* **B** || *νηῶν* RS(V) || *ἐβουλεύοντο* C*dz*, van H. **19.** 1 *ὁ* om. **B**, Holder

Od. 9. 62 f. *ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ, Ἄσμενοι ἐκ θανάτοιο, φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἑταίρους.*

2. **διακριθέντες.** The verb *διακρίνειν* is used of the physical separation of combatants in all three voices (Homer); cp. also Thuc. 1. 105. 5 *μάχης γενομένης ἰσορρόπου . . διεκρίθησαν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων.* (So in 3. 11. 2 of voluntary separation, secession, of allies.)

3. **τῶν μὲν νεκρῶν καὶ τῶν ναυηγίων ἐπεκράτεον** has a suggestion of victory about it, but probably is to be explained by the turn of the tide; cp. c. 12 *supra.* (May it be assumed that they buried the dead?)

4. **τρηχέως δὲ περιεφθέντες**: cp. 5. 1. It is admitted that the Greeks had been very roughly handled in this *naumachy*; and perhaps the Athenians, to whom the *Aristeia* were awarded, had borne the brunt of the fray; but that "the half of their ships" (nigh one hundred) were damaged must surely be an exaggeration, in view of their subsequent condition at Salamis. True, they may have had further vessels in reserve, and they had some time to refit before Salamis; but most probably the *τραύματα* were of every variety, and the half of the ships were only 'more or less' damaged. **τετρωμέναι ἦσαν** seems to give a somewhat different meaning to *ἐτέτρωντο*, the *ἦσαν* not being a mere auxiliary; the ships were there still, though in a damaged condition (*τιτρώσκειν* of ships, Thuc. 4. 14. 1).

5. **δρησμὸν δὴ ἐβούλευον**: this would be for the third time, if we could trust c. 4 *supra* and 7. 182. Placed here the statement amounts to a confession of defeat; but it is even yet hardly credible, before the arrival of the bad news from Thermopylai, after which, indeed, there was no further room for debate or delay; cp. c. 21 *infra.*

19. 1. **νόῳ δὲ λαβών**: the dative may be 'instrumental' or even 'locative'; the verb, which denotes physical action (9. 22, 119 etc.), may also denote a psychological act; cp. 9. 10 (6. 137, 4. 79).

ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης. The article may be taken to refer back to the occurrence of the name in c. 4 *supra*; cp. also c. 5. This fresh anecdote is less discreditable but hardly more credible, at least in its details and surroundings, than the other. Themistokles here assumes an initiative which belongs to Eurybiades (cp. c. 2 *supra*). Moreover, he summons the Strategoi to a council, when a council is already sitting (*ἐβούλευον* just above, cp. c. 21 *infra*). Further, he treats the question of retreat as settled, though that is just the question at issue—or rather, we may say, though Themistokles cannot have dreamt of retreat, so long as Leonidas held out; nor is it likely that Eurybiades and the Peloponnesian admirals committed themselves blindly to Themistokles. In the speech put into the Athenian's mouth two or three different devices with different objects are confusedly combined, and there is a suggestion of deceit and unscrupulousness imparted to the words and acts of Themistokles, quite in the style of the partisan legend. But that there is something historical at the back of this anecdote is likely enough. After retreat became inevitable, Themistokles and the Athenians perhaps volunteered, or were detailed, to cover the retreat (cp. c. 21). All along Themistokles (and the Athenians) will have been hoping and planning to detach the Ionians from the king's forces, perhaps to foment a new Ionian 'Revolt'; and Themistokles may have made or left appeals, addressed to the Ionians, behind him at Artemision (cp. c. 22 *infra*). The treatment of the Euboians and their flocks requires no justification; but the fires were not, we may suppose, merely sacrificial or

ἀπορραγείη ἀπὸ τοῦ βαρβάρου τό τε Ἰωνικὸν [φῦλον] καὶ τὸ Καρικόν, οἷοί τε εἴησαν <ἂν> τῶν λοιπῶν κατύπερθε γενέσθαι, ἐλαυνόντων τῶν Εὐβοέων πρόβατα ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ταύτην, συλλέξας τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἔλεγέ σφι ὡς δοκέοι ἔχειν τινὰ παλάμην, τῇ ἐλπίζοι τῶν βασιλέος συμμάχων ἀποστήσειν τοὺς ἀρίστους. ταῦτα μέν νυν ἐς τοσοῦτο παρεγύμνου, ἐπὶ

---

2 *βαρβαρικοῦ z* || *φῦλον* secl. Stein[3]: post *Καρικὸν* transt. *z* 3 *ἦσαν* C || *ἂν* add. Werfer, Stein[2] || *γίνεσθαι* **a**, Stein[1] 4 cf. comment. infra || *θάλασσαν, ταύτῃ* **B**, Valla, Holder, edd. plerique: *ταύτην* del. van H. 6 *ἐλπίζει* P*dz* || *βασιλέως* C: *βασιλῆος z* 7 *τοσοῦτον* **B**

---

culinary, but intended to deceive the Persians into the belief that the Greeks were still encamped at Artemision long after they had cleared out: a common stratagem (cp. Livy 22. 43. 6).

2. **τοῦ βαρβάρου** Baehr takes as masculine, and refers to the king; Stein, more subtly, as neuter, while admitting that the Attic form would be *βαρβαρικοῦ*, which is actually read; cp. App. Crit.

τό τε Ἰωνικὸν [φῦλον] καὶ τὸ Καρικόν: including doubtless the Dorians in Karia, and the neighbouring islands, whom, however, Hdt. does not specify. When Themistokles is represented as calling the Ionio-Karian contingent *τῶν βασιλέος συμμάχων τοὺς ἀρίστους*, he is made to use language which represents neither the Persian nor the Herodotean view; cp. below.

3. **τῶν λοιπῶν κατύπερθε γενέσθαι**: the two latter words = *κρατῆσαι*, cp. cc. 60, 75, 136 etc. The Greek contingents in the Persian fleet amounted all told to some 400 (407) vessels, according to the navy-list in Bk. 7. 89 ff.; the Ionio-Karian (+Dorian) in the stricter sense to exactly 200. Ariabignes was admiral of this squadron, but whether the Ionio-Karian division strictly corresponded to its title may be questioned. In either case the detachment of these contingents, especially after the losses of the king's fleet in the storm, or storms, would be a very serious blow. Baehr maintains that **ἄν** is not necessary in this apodosis.

4. **ἐλαυνόντων τῶν Εὐβοέων πρόβατα**, as usual; but what the practice, or the phrase, has to say to the context here is anything but obvious. The fate of the sheep has nothing to do with the Ionian question, or the device for detaching the Ionians from the king's fleet. Is it possible that the whole line is a mere gloss, which has made its way into the text, and at an absurd point? It would come in more logically after *ἔλεγέ σφι ὡς* below, or after *ἔλεγε* in l. 8.

5. **συλλέξας τοὺς στρατηγούς**: Themistokles could not do that; and they were already collected in council. Hdt. has apparently 'contaminated' two or three different anecdotes: (1) the appeal to the Ionians; (2) the provisioning of the fleet at the expense of the Euboians; (3) the ruse by which the Persians were led to believe that the Greek fleet was still at its moorings, and the soldiers still ashore at Artemision.

6. **παλάμην** = *τέχνην*, Suidas *sub v.* The word is Homeric, but not in that meaning, which is, however, frequent in Pindar; e.g. *Ol.* 13. 52 *Σίσυφον μὲν πυκνότατον παλάμαις ὡς θεόν*. Cp. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 644 f. *δεῖ δέ σε παντοίας πλέκειν εἰς ἀπόφυξιν παλάμας.* The word is especially appropriate on the lips of Themistokles, a veritable Palamedes.

συμμάχων . . τοὺς ἀρίστους: they are involuntary *σύμμαχοι*, but the word is used, perhaps, less in the derivative sense, of allies, than in the literal sense, of co-fighters; 'the most valiant' they could scarce be truly called among the king's fighting men (have not the Egyptians just gained the *Aristeia*? c. 17 *supra*); perhaps there is a slight Herodotean irony in the use of the term here.

7. **ἐς τοσοῦτο παρεγύμνου**, 'so much, and no more, he revealed' of his plan; cp. 5. 50, 7. 99. With *παρεγύμνου* cp. 1. 126 *ὁ Κῦρος παρεγύμνου τὸν πάντα λόγον*.

ἐπὶ τοῖσι κατήκουσι πρήγμασι: *pro praesenti rerum statu*, Baehr. Cp. 5. 49.

δὲ τοῖσι κατήκουσι πρήγμασι τάδε ποιητέα σφι εἶναι ἔλεγε, τῶν τε προβάτων τῶν Εὐβοϊκῶν καταθύειν ὅσα τις ἐθέλοι· κρέσσον γὰρ εἶναι τὴν <σφετέρην> στρατιὴν ἔχειν ἢ τοὺς πολεμίους· παραίνεέ τε προειπεῖν τοῖσι ἑωυτῶν ἑκάστους πυρὰ ἀνακαίειν· κομιδῆς δὲ πέρι τὴν ὥρην αὐτῷ μελήσειν, ὥστε ἀσινέας ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. ταῦτα ἤρεσέ σφι ποιέειν, καὶ αὐτίκα πυρὰ ἀνακαυσάμενοι ἐτράποντο πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα. οἱ γὰρ Εὐβοέες, παραχρησάμενοι τὸν Βάκιδος **20**
χρησμὸν ὡς οὐδὲν λέγοντα, οὔτε τι ἐξεκομίσαντο οὐδὲν οὔτε προσεσάξαντο ὡς παρεσομένου σφι πολέμου, περιπετέα τε

8 τῆσι **B** || εἶναί σφι(ν V) **B**: 'an σφι delendum?' Kallenberg 9 εὐβοεικῶν CPz || καταθύειν post ἐθέλοι z || θέλοι **B** 10 <σφετέρην> Stein$^{(2)3}$ 11 ἑωυτοῦ ἕκαστον Cobet, van H. || ἑκάστοις C 12 πυρὰ Cobet, Stein$^{(2)3}$: πῦρ codd., Stein^1, Holder, van H.: πυρὴν z || αὐτῶν C 13 ἐς: ἐπὶ z 14 πυρὰ Cobet, van H., Stein^3: πῦρ || καυσόμενοι **B** || ἐτρέποντο **a** 20. totum caput suspectum habeo 2 οὔτ' ἐξεκομίσαντο **B**z, Holder: οὔτε ἐξεκομίσαντο P, van H. || οὐδὲν alterum delendum vid. nisi τι potius omiseris, aut saltem post προσεσάξαντο transposueris 3 προεσάξαντο **B**z, Holder, van H.: προεφυλάξαντο Naber

9. **καταθύειν**: no doubt the sacrifice was to be followed by a feast; the animals were to be eaten by the fleet. Themistokles did not expect his men to fight on an empty stomach.

11. **παραίνεέ τε . . πυρὰ ἀνακαίειν**: there seems to be some confusion between the fires for burning, or roasting, the meat, and fires left burning, after the retreat of the Greeks, in order to deceive the enemy. It is not likely that the Greeks postponed seizing the sheep until the moment of their departure.

12. **κομιδῆς δὲ πέρι**: this sentence treats the resolution to retreat as already taken, at least by Themistokles. It could not have been so, before the disaster at Thermopylai was known.

τὴν ὥρην: cp. c. 14 *supra*.

20. 1. **οἱ γὰρ Εὐβοέες**: Blakesley endorses Schweighaeuser's observation that the proper place for c. 20 is immediately after c. 4 *supra*; but the displacement may be as old as Hdt.'s own composition. In which case, or otherwise, the connexion seems to be that, *à propos des moutons*, the question arises: how did it happen that the sheep were there to be looted after that fashion? Why, because the Euboians had made no preparations for the war, and that although there was an oracle of Bakis to warn them. But the authenticity of this chapter is not above suspicion.

παραχρησάμενοι τὸν Βάκιδος χρησμόν: *παραχρᾶσθαι* as in 4. 159, 1. 108; cp. 2. 141 *τὸν ἐν ἀλογίῃσι ἔχειν παραχρησάμενον τῶν μαχίμων*, and 4. 150 *ἀλογίην εἶχον τοῦ χρηστηρίου*. The word as used in 7. 223 has a further application. *Βάκις* may be connected with *βάζειν*, *βακ-* to say, speak, though the verb *βακίζειν* in Aristophanes *Peace* 1072 is no doubt formed from the proper name. The word *Βάκιδες* is associated with *Σίβυλλαι* by Aristotle, *Probl.* 30. 1 = 954 A, in such a way as to suggest that the ancients themselves regarded the name rather as a generic term than as a proper name; but there were two or three *Βάκιδες* of especial fame, to whom the title was successively appropriated, a Boiotian, an Attic, an Arkadian. (Cp. Pauly-Wissowa ii. 2802.) It is probably the Boiotian of Eleon (cp. 5. 43) that Hdt. believes himself to be quoting here, and in cc. 77, 96 *infra*, and 9. 43. Special collections of oracles of Bakis, of Musaios (cp. 7. 6), and others, had come much into fashion in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. with the development, or revival, of mysteries, orgies, and other religious consolations; cp. E. Rhode, *Psyche* (1894), pp. 351 ff.; J. B. Bury, *Hist. of Greece*, i. (1902) 335.

3. **προσεσάξαντο**: cp. 5. 34, 1. 190. The *v.l.* *προεσάξαντο*, from *προσάττειν*, is preferred also by Baehr and Sitzler.

ἐποιήσαντο σφίσι αὐτοὶ τὰ πρήγματα. Βάκιδι γὰρ ὧδε ἔχει περὶ τούτων ὁ χρησμός.

φράζεο, βαρβαρόφωνος ὅταν ζυγὸν εἰς ἅλα βάλλῃ
βύβλινον, Εὐβοίης ἀπέχειν πολυμηκάδας αἶγας.

τούτοισι οὐδὲν τοῖσι ἔπεσι χρησαμένοισι ἐν τοῖσι τότε παρεοῦσί τε καὶ προσδοκίμοισι κακοῖσι παρῆν σφι συμφορῇ χρᾶσθαι πρὸς τὰ μέγιστα.

21 Οἱ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἔπρησσον, παρῆν δὲ ὁ ἐκ Τρηχῖνος κατάσκοπος. ἦν μὲν γὰρ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ κατάσκοπος Πολύας, γένος Ἀντικυρεύς, τῷ προσετέτακτο, καὶ εἶχε πλοῖον κατῆρες ἕτοιμον, εἰ παλήσειε ὁ ναυτικὸς στρατός, σημαίνειν τοῖσι ἐν

---

4 αὐτοὶ Stein[3] : αὐτοῖσι   6 βαρβαρόφωνος Valla (*barbaricus*) : βαρβαρόφωνον || ὅτ' ἂν A : ἐστὰν B || ἄλλα **B**   7 βύβλιον **B** || πολὺ μηκάδας SV, van H.   8 τούτοισι δὲ **B**, Stein[1], Holder : 'an τούτοισι δὴ ?' van H.   9 χρῆσθαι **a**   10 πρὸς : ἐς van H.   **21.** 4 ἑτοῖμον CP*dz*, van H. : del. Bekker || παλήσιεν **B** : παλαίσειεν C : ἀπελάσειε Valla (*discessisset*) : τι πταίσειε Valckenaer

---

περιπετέα τε ἐποιήσαντο . . τὰ πρήγματα: *sed res suas ipsi in summum discrimen adduxerunt*, Schweig. followed by Baehr. *περιπετής* is used literally of 'falling round' or upon an object (cp. Soph. *Ai.* 907, *Ant.* 1223); metaphorically, of 'falling in with' evil or misfortune. It may be used here with the further suggestion of a sudden change or reverse of fortune; but that seems unnecessary. Rather the word here appears to come short of its fuller force, inasmuch as danger rather than actual disaster appears indicated. At any rate (as Stein observes), except for the sack of Histiaiotis c. 23 *infra*, the Euboians are not recorded to have suffered; the Persian fleet made straight from Histiaia to Phaleron, c. 66 *infra*. The Euboians, indeed, appear to have suffered almost as much from their friends as from their enemies.

6. **ὅταν ζυγὸν εἰς ἅλα βάλλῃ βύβλινον** appears to be a clear reference to the bridging of the sea (Hellespont); cp. 7. 25, 34, 36; though it might conceivably refer merely to the employment of byblos-hawsers for ordinary marine or naval purposes. Cp. c. 77 *infra*.

7. **πολυμηκάς** appears to be an *ἅπαξ λεγ.*

8. **τούτοισι οὐδὲν τοῖσι ἔπεσι χρησαμένοισι.** *οὐδὲν χρησαμένοισι* means 'after utterly neglecting, disregarding'; cp. 5. 72 *τῇ κληδόνι οὐδὲν χρεώμενος.* The personal subject is supplied by **σφι.** This short sentence is a clumsy and inelegant one; there are ten words in the dative in four different constructions: *τούτοισι* might be masculine, but for the belated *σφι*; *χρησαμένοισι* followed by *χρᾶσθαι* and *παρεοῦσι* followed by *παρῆν*, and *παρῆν* again by *παρῆν* in the next line (c. 21), are stylistic abortions; in short, with the wry setting of the chapter, and other peculiarities, doubts as to its authenticity are legitimate.

21. 1. **ἔπρησσον** Stein takes = *ἐποίεον* (cp. 4. 145), Sitzler as = *ἔπαθον* (*sic*). It refers back to *ταῦτα ἤρεσέ σφι ποιέειν* c. 19 *supra*. The *μέν* and *δέ* here almost constitute a parataxis.

ὁ ἐκ Τρηχῖνος κατάσκοπος: the article is explained by what follows. That the scout, or aide-de-camp, is described as *ἐκ Τρηχῖνος*, a place apparently in the hands of Xerxes, is observable, but may be explained by 7. 176, where *ἡ διὰ Τρηχῖνος ἔσοδος* is apparently used for the pass of Thermopylai, though it probably should have denoted a different one; cp. note *ad l.c.*

2. **Πολύας γένος Ἀντικυρεύς.** The man's name seems to be unique. On Antikyra cp. 7. 198, 213. Polyas was presumably from the Malian city.

3. **πλοῖον κατῆρες**, a boat fitted, or well-fitted with oars: *κατήρης* perhaps = *εὐήρης*. The same stem is seen in *τριήρης* etc. Cp. note to 7. 36.

4. **παλήσειε**: apparently from a verb *παλέω*, the Ionic form of *παλαίω* (*πάλη*),

Θερμοπύλῃσι ἐοῦσι· ὣς δ' αὔτως ἦν Ἀβρώνιχος ὁ Λυσικλέος Ἀθηναῖος καὶ παρὰ Λεωνίδῃ ἕτοιμος τοῖσι ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ ἐοῦσι ἀγγέλλειν τριηκοντέρῳ, ἤν τι καταλαμβάνῃ νεώτερον τὸν πεζόν. οὗτος ὦν ὁ Ἀβρώνιχος ἀπικόμενός σφι ἐσήμαινε τὰ γεγονότα περὶ Λεωνίδην καὶ τὸν στρατὸν αὐτοῦ. οἳ δὲ ὡς ἐπύθοντο ταῦτα, οὐκέτι ἐς ἀναβολὰς ἐποιεῦντο τὴν ἀποχώρησιν, ἐκομίζοντο δὲ ὡς ἕκαστοι ἐτάχθησαν, Κορίνθιοι πρῶτοι, ὕστατοι δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι. Ἀθηναίων δὲ νέας τὰς ἄριστα πλεούσας ἐπιλε- 22
ξάμενος Θεμιστοκλέης ἐπορεύετο περὶ τὰ πότιμα ὕδατα,

---

5 ως AB: ὡς P*dz* || ἀβρόνιχος B: ἀβρόνυχος *d* : Αβρώνυχος *z* 6 λεωνίδην S || ἑτοῖμος CP*dz*, van H. 8 ἀβρόνυχος *d* : Αβρώνυχος *z* || ἐσήμηνε **B** 9 λεωνίδεα **B***z* || <τε>καὶ? Kallenberg 10 οὐκ ἐς ἀμβολὰς Cobet || ἐποιέοντο **B**P*z* 11 Κορίνθιοι <μὲν>? Stein[2]
22. 1 νῆας **B** || πλωούσας **B***z*

---

to wrestle, to engage; here obviously a euphemism for 'succumb' or 'encounter a fall.' Hesychius has the gloss *παλήσειε· διαφθείρειε* (*διαφθαρείη* Valckenaer). The emendation of the Herodotean text (cp. App. Crit.) is hardly necessary, but Baehr's note is worth consulting.

5. **ὣς δ' αὔτως**: as in 9. 81 *et al.*

Ἀβρώνιχος ὁ Λυσικλέος: the same man, doubtless, who reappears in the winter of 479–8 B.C. as colleague of Themistokles and Aristeides in the embassy to Sparta about the fortification of Athens; Thuc. 1. 91. 3. Lysikles was a not uncommon name at Athens; the man here mentioned might be conceivably the grandfather of the well-known Lysikles, who belonged apparently to the entourage of Perikles; cp. Thuc. 3. 19. 1; Aristoph. *Knights* 765; Plutarch, *Perikl.* 24.

7. **τριηκοντέρῳ**: a galley with thirty oars; probably a distinction, without a difference, from *πλοῖον κατῆρες supra.*

ἤν τι καταλαμβάνῃ νεώτερον: *νεώτερον* is a familiar euphemism; *καταλ.*, cp. c. 6 *supra*; but here with a suggestion of evil. Cp. *εἰ παλήσειε supra*, and for an inverse change of construction cp. 9. 48.

8. **τὰ γεγονότα**: a strict temporal pluperfect; **περί**, 'in the case of . .'

10. **οὐκέτι ἐς ἀναβολὰς ἐποιεῦντο τὴν ἀποχώρησιν**, 'considered the retreat no longer a matter for delay . .' That they could not strategically have retreated before the fall of Leonidas, nor reasonably have delayed afterwards, is not apparent to Hdt. Plutarch *de malig. Hdti.* 34 = *Mor.* 867 puts the connexion more clearly: *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν ὄφελος ἐνταῦθα καθημένους φρουρεῖν τὴν θάλασσαν, ἐντὸς Πυλῶν τοῦ πολέμου γεγονότος, καὶ Ξέρξου τῶν παρόδων κρατοῦντος.*

11. **ὡς ἕκαστοι ἐτάχθησαν**, 'each contingent in order, as previously posted': these words, perhaps purposely introduced by Hdt., rob the record of the sneer at the expense of the Korinthians, which it must otherwise have conveyed, and may have conveyed in its original Attic form. The Herodotean version is clearly acceptable: the retreat was a perfectly orderly proceeding; the Korinthians had apparently occupied the left wing of the fleet; the Athenians, probably at the suggestion of Themistokles, cp. c. 19 *supra*, remained somewhat in the rear to cover the retreat and to inscribe an appeal to their kinsmen and quondam allies now in the ranks of the Persian. On **ὡς** cp. c. 2 *supra.*

22. 2. **Θεμιστοκλέης** here puts into operation the *παλάμη* announced in c. 19 *supra*. The employment of **ἐπιλεξάμενος** followed by **ἐπελέξαντο** in a different sense (*ἐπιλέγεσθαι eligere* 6. 73, 7. 10, etc., *legere* c. 136 *infra*, etc.) is not quite happy: an 'unconscious iteration.'

ἐπορεύετο περὶ τὰ πότιμα ὕδατα: he would, of course, have to land in order to do this: what time of day was it? The battle had begun at mid-day, or somewhat later, c. 15 *supra*; the hour at which it ended has not been specified; but it had been a long and heavy engagement, in which half the Athenian vessels had been damaged (c.

ἐντάμνων ἐν τοῖσι λίθοισι γράμματα, τὰ Ἴωνες ἐπελθόντες τῇ ὑστεραίῃ [ἡμέρῃ] ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐπελέξαντο. τὰ δὲ γράμματα τάδε ἔλεγε. "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, οὐ ποιέετε δίκαια ἐπὶ τοὺς πατέρας στρατευόμενοι καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καταδουλούμενοι. ἀλλὰ μάλιστα μὲν πρὸς ἡμέων γίνεσθε· εἰ δὲ ὑμῖν ἐστι τοῦτο μὴ δυνατὸν ποιῆσαι, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἡμῖν ἕζεσθε καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ τῶν Καρῶν δέεσθε τὰ αὐτὰ ὑμῖν ποιέειν. εἰ δὲ μηδέτερον τούτων οἷόν τε γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀναγκαίης μέζονος κατέζευχθε ἢ ὥστε ἀπίστασθαι, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, ἐπεὰν συμμίσγωμεν, ἐθελοκακέετε, μεμνημένοι ὅτι ἀπ' ἡμέων

3–5 τὰ . . γράμματα om. **β** 4 ἡμέρῃ damn. van H., Stein^3 5 τάδε ἔλεγε: λέγοντα τάδε **β** 7 γίνεσθαι **α**, 'forsan recte' van H. 8 ὑμέες **β**P*z* 9 ἵζεσθε malit van H.: ἔσεσθε **β***z* || δέεσθαι B || ταῦτα R: (ταυτὰ SV) 10 ἀνάγκης μείζονος **α** 11 ὥστε μὴ ἀπίστασθαι **β** || δὲ: γε **β**P*z*, Holder 12 συμμίξωμεν *d*

---

18 *supra*): then, according to Hdt., a council was held—the account of which is obscure. Then, the news of the disaster at Thermopylai is brought by Abronichos, and retreat becomes at once inevitable; but Themistokles now proceeds to carry out his projected παλάμη. How many the springs, or fountains, to which the device was applied Hdt. does not say.

3. **ἐντάμνων ἐν τοῖσι λίθοισι γράμματα.** We are to understand that these inscriptions were incised (and coloured?) in the living rocks, or in some cases in the stones (marble) with which the springs, or cisterns, were fenced and builded. These inscriptions were read by the Ionians on the very next day; cp. c. 23 *infra*: were they ever read by any other mortals thereafter? How many times the inscription was reproduced by Themistokles Hdt. does not specify, but he gives the *ipsissima verba*, which 'cut the record,' for argument and rhetoric in inscriptions, a veritable 'sermon in stones'; had Hdt. copied the same? Did 'Ionians' remember and report them at home? Is the anecdote an Attic invention? The appeal reads in any case more like a letter or an oral address than like a hastily cut inscription, and that in duplicate. There was no need to cut these inscriptions; they might as well have been simply written or painted up.

4. **τὰ δὲ γράμματα τάδε ἔλεγε**: a conclusive proof of the use of λέγειν, λόγοι, *et sim.* for script. The order of the words τάδε ἔλεγε is unusual, but occurs also 2. 136 in a less abrupt form.

5. **ἐπὶ τοὺς πατέρας**: cp. 7. 51, where the same point and the same moral are urged by Artabanos.

7. **μάλιστα μὲν . . εἰ δὲ . . μή**: perhaps the earliest instance of the employment of this rhetorical formula; cp. Thuc. 1. 40. 4, Plato *Rep.* 590 D, etc.

8. **ὑμεῖς δέ**: a genuine δέ *in apodosi*; the construction is repeated immediately below; cp. 7. 50, and Index.

ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἡμῖν ἕζεσθε, 'assume a neutral position'; cp. 4. 118 ὑμεῖς ὦν μηδενὶ τρόπῳ ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι περιίδητε ἡμέας διαφθαρέντας. Also 3. 83 and c. 73 *infra*. ἡμῖν *dat. ethicus*, 'we pray you'—

9. **τῶν Καρῶν δέεσθε**: cp. c. 19 *supra*; and for δέεσθαι cc. 3, 4 *supra*.

10. **εἰ δὲ μηδέτερον τούτων**: three courses are open to the Ionians, more or less consistent with their duty to their fathers: (i.) μάλιστα μέν, to desert the Persian and join the Greeks (πρὸς Ἑλλήνων γίνεσθαι); (ii.) εἰ δὲ μή, to leave the Persian and assume a neutral position (ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἕζεσθαι, κατῆσθαι); (iii.) to play the Persian false in the hour of battle (ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ἐθελοκακέειν).

11. **μέζονος . . ἢ ὥστε ἀπίστασθαι.** The conjunction ὥστε is not *de rigueur* in this construction of the infinitive after a comparative, but is certainly in place; cp. Madvig, *G.S.* 150 *c*.

γεγόνατε καὶ ὅτι ἀρχῆθεν ἡ ἔχθρη πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον ἀπ' ὑμέων ἡμῖν γέγονε." Θεμιστοκλέης δὲ ταῦτα ἔγραφε, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἐπ' ἀμφότερα νοέων, ἵνα ἢ λαθόντα τὰ γράμματα βασιλέα Ἴωνας ποιήσῃ μεταβαλεῖν καὶ γενέσθαι πρὸς ἑωυτῶν, ἢ ἐπείτε ἀνενειχθῇ καὶ διαβληθῇ πρὸς Ξέρξην, ἀπίστους ποιήσῃ τοὺς Ἴωνας καὶ τῶν ναυμαχιέων αὐτοὺς ἀπόσχῃ.

Θεμιστοκλέης μὲν ταῦτα ἐνέγραψε. τοῖσι δὲ βαρβάροισι **23** *αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα πλοίῳ ἦλθε ἀνὴρ Ἱστιαιεὺς ἀγγέλλων τὸν δρησμὸν τὸν ἀπ' Ἀρτεμισίου τῶν Ἑλλήνων. οἳ δ' ὑπ' ἀπιστίης τὸν μὲν ἀγγέλλοντα εἶχον ἐν φυλακῇ, νέας δὲ ταχέας ἀπέστειλαν προκατοψομένας· ἀπαγγειλάντων δὲ τούτων τὰ ἦν, οὕτω δὴ ἅμα ἡλίῳ σκιδναμένῳ πᾶσα ἡ στρατιὴ ἐπέπλεε ἁλὴς ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον. ἐπισχόντες δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χώρῳ μέχρι*

---

13 *ἀρχῆθεν* post *ἔχθρη* *d* || *ἡ* om. **B** 14 *δὲ* om. **B** || *ἔγραψε* **B**, Holder, van H. : *ἐνέγραφε*? hic idem 16, 17 *ποιήσει* (bis) **B** || *μεταβαλέειν* **B** || *ἐπείτε* : *ἐπεὰν* Krueger, van H. || *ἀνενεχθῆι* AB || *ξέρξεα* **B**P*z* 18 *συμμαχιέων* *z* **23.** 2 *ἱστιεὺς* P*d* : *ἰστιεὺς* C : Ιστιεὺς *z* 3 *δὲ* **B** 4 *νῆας* **B***z* || *ταχείας* codd. *z* 5 *τουτέων* **a** 6 *οὕτωι* B || *ἅμ'* CP*dz* || *ἔπλεε* P, Holder : *ἔπλωε(ν* V) **B***z*, van H. || *ἁλὴς* **a** : *ἁλλὴς* **B**

---

13. **ἀρχῆθεν ἡ ἔχθρη**: a parallel argument is addressed to the Athenians by the Spartans c. 142 *infra*. The reference here is, of course, to the Ionian revolt and the part taken by Athens therein; but, as Hdt. 5. 73, 96, 97 clearly shows, the *casus belli* between Athens and Persia was already in existence before Athens espoused the cause of the Ionians, and the participation in the Ionian revolt was the effect and not the cause of the Athenian enmity with Sardes and with Susa.

14. **δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἐπ' ἀμφότερα νοέων**: was this very obvious design really a discovery of Hdt.'s, or was the double-mindedness of Themistokles other than commendable?

16. **μεταβαλεῖν**, intransitive; 7. 52.

17. **καὶ διαβληθῇ**: sc. *τὰ γράμματα*; a curious phrase, though the meaning of *διαβάλλειν* cannot be doubtful; cp. 5. 50, 97 etc. But the sentence is rather clumsy, *τὰ γράμματα* as the subject of *ποιήσῃ* and of *ἀπόσχῃ* being harsh.

ἀπίστους, passive; 9. 98.

23. 2. **αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα**: still at night?

πλοίῳ: the size of this boat is not specified; was the man of Histiaia alone in it? And why is not his proper name given? The retreat is a **δρησμός**—is that the man's word, or Hdt.'s?

3. **ὑπ' ἀπιστίης**: the man evidently went to Aphetai; if the Persian admirals actually disbelieved his report, they can hardly have heard as yet of the capture of Thermopylai. **εἶχον ἐν φυλακῇ**, 'kept under arrest.'

5. **τούτων**, masculine, of the men on the ships; cp. 7. 179. 4 *supra*. **τὰ ἦν**: the true state of the case, the facts.

6. **ἅμα ἡλίῳ σκιδναμένῳ**: dawn of the fourth day (say Wednesday); the phrase is peculiar: *σκίδναμαι* (*σκίδνημι*), cp. 7. 141 (*σκιδναμένης Δημήτερος*), here seems to refer to the dispersion of light, the diffusion of rays by the sun. Blakesley cps. Milton's "Morn sowing the earth with orient pearl." Cp. also Aischyl. *Pers.* 502 *πρὶν σκεδασθῆναι θεοῦ Ἀκτῖνας*. Also *Psalm* 97. 11 (R.V. "Light is sown for the righteous").

πᾶσα ἡ στρατιή: sc. *ἡ ναυτική*.

ἁλής, without stragglers, and without detaching any scouts, etc., *en masse*.

7. **ἐπισχόντες . . μέχρι μέσου ἡμέρης**: the hour at which they had moved out to battle on the previous day (c. 15 *supra*, which also shows that *μέσου* here is neuter). The double omission of

μέσου ἡμέρης, τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου ἔπλεον ἐς Ἱστιαίην· ἀπικόμενοι δὲ τὴν πόλιν ἔσχον τῶν Ἱστιαιέων, καὶ τῆς Ἐλλοπίης μοίρης γῆς δὲ τῆς Ἱστιαιώτιδος τὰς παραθαλασσίας κώμας πάσας ἐπέδραμον.

24 *Ἐνθαῦτα δὲ τούτων ἐόντων, Ξέρξης ἑτοιμασάμενος τὰ περὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἔπεμπε ἐς τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν κήρυκα, προετοιμάσατο δὲ τάδε· ὅσοι τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ ἑωυτοῦ ἦσαν νεκροὶ ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι (ἦσαν δὲ καὶ δύο μυριάδες), ὑπολιπόμενος*

---

8 *ἔπλωον* **B**z, van H. || *ἱστιαίην* C*d* 9 *ἱστιαιέων* S: *ἱστιαίων* || *ἐλλογίμης* **B** 10 *ἱστιαιώτιδος* C*d*: *ἱστιαιητίδος* **B** || *τὰς* om. **B** **24.** 1 *τὰ* om. **B** 2 *στρατὸν* om. **B** || *προητοιμάσατο* **a** 3 *τοῦ* post *στρατοῦ* om. C 4 *καὶ*: *ὡς* Naber || *ὑπολειπόμενος* C(superscr.) *d*: *ὑπολοιπόμενος* z

---

the article may be easily understood in a colloquialism. There is no eagerness to pursue the Greek fleet; cp. c. 10 *supra.* **τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου** appears to be temporal.

9. **τὴν πόλιν ἔσχον**: cp. 7. 164 for the strong *ἔχω*. They seem to have had no resistance to encounter. **Ἱστιαία** (*ἡ*) suffered afterwards a worse fate from the Athenians in 446 B.C., *Ἑστιαιᾶς δὲ ἐξοικίσαντες αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον*, Thuc. 1. 114. 3; cp. Hicks, *Manual*,[2] p. 65, though there is no reference to that catastrophe here. It hardly seems likely that Histiaia was no more and its place taken by Oreos (the name which yet prevails) when Hdt. wrote this passage; in other words, the first draft of his history is appreciably older than the thirty years' truce; cp. Introduction, § 9.

τῆς Ἐλλοπίης μοίρης γῆς δὲ τῆς Ἱστιαιώτιδος: commentators (so Rawlinson, Baehr) have misunderstood the relation of these terms, and made *ἡ Ἐλλοπίη μοίρη* a part of *Histiaiotis*; as Stein rightly points out, *γῆς δέ* is a "second closer definition," according to a regular use of *δέ*, cp. 1. 114. The Persians did not over-run Euboia, but only Ellopia, or Hellopia, nor all Hellopia, but only Histiaiotis, nor yet quite all Histiaiotis, but only *τὰς παραθαλασσίας κώμας*—though not one of those they spared (*πάσας*). The Persians did not venture far from their ships. Hellopia is no doubt the land of the *Ἕλλοπες*, an interesting and surely primitive folk, in view of their congeners *Δρύοπες*, *Δόλοπες*, *Κέκροπες* (*Κεκροπίδαι*), *Κύκλοπες* (*Κύκλωπες*), *Πέλοπες* (*Πελοπίδαι*) and others like. Perhaps *Ἕλλοπες* is not far removed from *Ἕλληνες* itself; Strabo 445 gives *Ἐλλοπία* as a name for Euboia, *ἀπὸ Ἕλλοπος τοῦ Ἴωνος*. Elsewhere (328) he quotes Philochoros as saying *τὸν περὶ Δωδώνην τόπον, ὥσπερ τὴν Εὔβοιαν, Ἑλλοπίαν κληθῆναι* (on the authority of Hesiod); and connects *Ἑλλοί* (*Σελλοί*) and *Ἕλλοπες*.

24. 1. **τὰ περὶ τοὺς νεκρούς**, the title of this anecdote, which seems quite independent of the record in 7. 238.

4. **καὶ δύο μυριάδες**, 'about (even) twenty thousand': of these the king buried 19,000 and left 1000 unburied, as a preparation for the ensuing comedy. The figures and the farce are alike incredible: 20,000 men cannot have fallen at Thermopylai, still less could 19,000 have been so speedily interred; nor is it by any means certain that the Persian king would have caused them to be interred at all—exposure being perhaps the Persian custom; cp. 7. 117—though doubtless he would have permitted the various nations concerned each to follow its own rite. Nor, had the king attempted such a fraud, could he have hoped to silence men's tongues, or befool their eyes. It is likely enough that a good many of the slain had been interred before the visitors from the fleet made their appearance at Thermopylai; for the rest, the anecdote seems to be part of the comic Nemesis which Greek anecdote-mongers inflicted upon Xerxes (cp. Introduction, § 11). It forms in any case a contrast to the Spartan review of the Persian dead at Marathon, 6. 120—a truly dignified proceeding. Perhaps **ὡς χιλίους** represents about the numbers of the Persian slain in the third engagement.

τούτων ὡς χιλίους, τοὺς λοιποὺς τάφρους ὀρυξάμενος ἔθαψε, φυλλάδα τε ἐπιβαλὼν καὶ γῆν ἐπαμησάμενος, ἵνα μὴ ὀφθείησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατοῦ. ὡς δὲ διέβη ἐς τὴν Ἱστιαίην ὁ κῆρυξ, σύλλογον ποιησάμενος παντὸς τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἄνδρες σύμμαχοι, βασιλεὺς Ξέρξης τῷ βουλομένῳ ὑμέων παραδίδωσι ἐκλιπόντα τὴν τάξιν καὶ ἐλθόντα θεήσασθαι ὅκως μάχεται πρὸς τοὺς ἀνοήτους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οἳ ἤλπισαν τὴν βασιλέος δύναμιν ὑπερβαλέεσθαι." **25**
ταῦτα ἐπαγγειλαμένου, μετὰ ταῦτα οὐδὲν ἐγίνετο πλοίων σπανιώτερον· οὕτω πολλοὶ ἤθελον θεήσασθαι. διαπεραιωθέντες δὲ ἐθηεῦντο διεξιόντες τοὺς νεκρούς· πάντες δὲ ἠπιστέατο τοὺς κειμένους εἶναι πάντας Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ Θεσπιέας, ὁρῶντες καὶ τοὺς εἵλωτας. οὐ

---

6 *φυλάδα* A[1]: *φυλλάδας* S || *ἐπιβάλλων* **B** 7 *ἰστιαίην* Cd 9 *ξύμμαχοι* z 10 *καὶ* om. **B**, Holder || *θεήσεσθαι* Ask. 12 *βασιλέως* C: *βασιλῆος* z || *ὑπερβαλέσθαι* **B**: *ὑπερβαλεῖσθαι* van H. **25.** 2 *ἐγένετο* CP 3 *θεήσεσθαι* z || *ἐθηέοντο* SV: *ἐθηεῦντο* . . *δὲ* om. R 4 *πάντες*: *πάντας* Cobet || *πάντας* del. idem 5 *καὶ Θεσπιέας* suspecta mihi || *ὁρῶντες* **a**: *ὁρέωντες* C: *ὁρέοντες* **B**, etc., Stein[1]

---

5. **τάφρους ὀρυξάμενος**: cp. *τάφρον μεγάλην ὀρύξαντες* c. 28 *infra*. The king did not work with his own hands, **ἐπιβαλών** notwithstanding.

6. **φυλλάδα τε ἐπιβαλὼν καὶ γῆν ἐπαμησάμενος.** Stein takes *φ. ἐπιβ.* as a *hysteron proteron* with *γ. ἐπαμ.* The earth would first be filled in, heaped up (*ἐπαμάομαι*), and the leaves then strawed over to conceal the diggings. *φυλλάς*, collective, like *λιθάς*, *νιφάς*, *ἱππάς*.

ἵνα μὴ ὀφθείησαν: sc. *αἱ τάφροι* rather than *οἱ νεκροί*. With the construction cp. c. 7 *supra*.

8. **σύλλογον ποιησάμενος**: cp. c. 83 *infra*.

παντὸς τοῦ στρατοπέδου: sc. *τοῦ ναυτικοῦ*. He would need an interpreter, or rather a number of interpreters, to address the motley array.

9. **σύμμαχοι** is polite; cp. c. 19 *supra*.

10. **παραδίδωσι**, 'permits, gives leave'; in 6. 103, with a slightly different suggestion, the victor Miltiades *παραδιδοῖ Πεισιστράτῳ ἀνακηρυχθῆναι*.

12. **ὑπερβαλέεσθαι**: *superare*, 7. 39, 163.

25. 1. **ἐπαγγειλαμένου**: the king, through his herald. On the word cp. 7. 1.

2. **οὐδὲν ἐγίνετο πλοίων σπανιώτερον**: they went across in small boats, and the supply was soon exhausted. Their own *πλοῖα* were still perhaps at Aphetai, and only the local stock available. Some of these might make the passage more than once; it must have been a busy scene, the straits alive with small craft; but there is a suspicion of persiflage about Hdt.'s expression.

3. **διεξιόντες**, between the Greek on the one hand and the Persian on the other; or perhaps, more generally, passing right through the Greek dead; cp. 7. 39. (It is not clear that the 1000 were lying about, scattered where, *ex hypothesi*, they had fallen.)

4. **ἠπιστέατο**, 'were firmly convinced'—though utterly mistaken. The word with Hdt. carries no implication of scientific or accurate knowledge, but can scarcely be a mere synonym for *νομίζειν*. If **καὶ Θεσπιέας** (cp. 7. 222) be not a gloss, it is explained by the next words. Or should it follow *ὁρῶντες*?

5. **ὁρῶντες καὶ τοὺς εἵλωτας.** The argument is not clear, for Helots were in a sense 'Lakedaimonians'; did the sight-seers mistake Helots for Thespians? But cp. previous note. Except for 7. 229, this is the only express indication of the presence of Helots at Thermopylai. Though the sight-seers fell into this error about the Greek dead (a strange error, with the Greeks from the king's navy among them!), they

μὲν οὐδ' ἐλάνθανε τοὺς διαβεβηκότας Ξέρξης ταῦτα πρήξας περὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἑωυτοῦ· καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ γελοῖον ἦν· τῶν μὲν χίλιοι ἐφαίνοντο [νεκροὶ] κείμενοι, οἳ δὲ πάντες ἐκέατο ἁλέες συγκεκομισμένοι ἐς τὠυτὸ χωρίον, τέσσερες χιλιάδες. ταύτην μὲν τὴν ἡμέρην πρὸς θέην ἐτράποντο, τῇ δ' ὑστεραίῃ οἳ μὲν ἀπέπλεον ἐς Ἱστιαίην ἐπὶ τὰς νέας, οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ Ξέρξην ἐς ὁδὸν ὁρμέατο.

26 *Ἧκον δέ σφι αὐτόμολοι ἄνδρες ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης ὀλίγοι τινές,*

---

6 *ξέρξης δὲ* **B** 8 *νεκροὶ* secl. Stein[2] 9 *τέσσαρες* C*d* : *τέσσερες χιλιάδες* del. Heraeus, Holder : (*χειλιάδες* van H. constanter) 10 *δὲ* **B** 11 *ἀπέπλωον* **B** || *ἰστιαίην* *d* || *νῆας* **B***z* || *ξέρξεα* **B** 12 *ὡρμέατο* P*dz*

---

were not taken in by the (supposed) trick devised by the king, as above described, in relation to the dead bodies of his own warriors.

7. **καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ γελοῖον ἦν**: the comic Nemesis proceeds.

8. **τῶν μὲν . . κείμενοι**: of the Persian side a thousand were to be seen lying (about on the field, just where they had fallen ?); meantime 19,000 had been collected and buried!

οἳ δὲ . . τέσσερες χιλιάδες. Hdt. apparently means that the king had caused all the Greek bodies to be collected in one place. It is possible that something of the kind had been done; in any case the *χωρίον*, the spot where the Greek dead would be thickest piled, was no doubt the hill on which the last stand had been made; 7. 225 ff. Around the hill might well be lying the corpses of the king's men, where they had fought and fallen. Stein thinks the object (of the king—or the story-teller ?) was to make it appear that 4000 Greeks had been slain by 1000 Persians, 4 Greeks by each Persian (*je vier von einem*); but, really, neither Hdt., nor in the last resort Xerxes, can well have expected any one to believe that the 4000 dead Greeks had been slain wholly and solely by the dead Persians! The trick was devised, or supposed to have been devised, to exhibit the proportional losses on each side. The figure 4000 for the Greek dead comes no doubt from a misapplication of the epigram in 7. 228, which gives 4000 as the number of *Peloponnesians* who *fought*, not the number of *Greeks* who *fell*, at Thermopylai. Stein here seems to overlook *ἐκ Πελοποννάσου* there and makes the 4000 include Thebans and Thespians. 3100 Peloponnesian Hoplites are accounted for in 7. 202; but there were probably 1000 'Lakedaimonians' to boot, even not including the Helots; or the 4000 might less probably be made up of 3100 + 900 Helots, 3 for each Spartiate. The actual number of Greek fighting men at Thermopylai, first and last, far exceeded 4000: albeit they may not all have been posted at Thermopylai proper; cp. *l.c.*

10. **ταύτην μὲν τὴν ἡμέρην**: there has been no clear indication of a change of day since the dawn of the *ὑστεραίῃ* (cp. cc. 22, 23 *supra*) of the battle; but it seems more natural, considering all that has taken place in the interval, to reckon 'this day' here as a different one, i.e. at least the 'fifth' day of the memorable week: *τῇ ὑστεραίῃ* would then be the sixth. The story and journal of the fleet is here dropped, not to be renewed till c. 66 *infra*.

26. 1. **ἧκον**: i.e. before the Persians left Thermopylai. These Arkadian medizers, or mercenaries, were long ago traced to Karyai (*vide* Schweighaeuser *in loco*) on the strength of Vitruvius 1. 1, who, in explaining the origin of *Caryatides* (in architecture), mentioned that Carya had joined the Persians against Greece. A medizing movement in Arkadia might help, with the attitude of Argos, to explain a good deal in the policy of the Peloponnesians during the war; but does this anecdote go beyond a mercenary adventure? Even so, it is significant of the miserable lack of pan-Hellenic sentiment or loyalty in the peninsula; albeit these very men have a word to say concerning the Olympiad, a celebration which existed to emphasize the 'Unity of Hellas'; cp.

βίου τε δεόμενοι καὶ ἐνεργοὶ βουλόμενοι εἶναι. ἄγοντες δὲ τούτους ἐς ὄψιν τὴν βασιλέος ἐπυνθάνοντο οἱ Πέρσαι περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τί ποιέοιεν· εἷς δέ τις πρὸ πάντων ἦν ὁ εἰρωτῶν αὐτοὺς ταῦτα. οἳ δέ σφι ἔλεγον ὡς Ὀλύμπια ἄγουσι καὶ θεωρέοιεν ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν καὶ ἱππικόν. ὃ δὲ ἐπείρετο ὅ

---

26. 2 *ἀγαγόντες* CP*dz*, van H. 3 *τὴν βασιλέως* C : *τὴν βασιλῆος* *z* : *τῶ βασιλεῖ d* Paris. 1634 : *τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐς ὄψιν* Paris. 2933 4 *τί* : *τὰ* (**B**), van H. 5 *εἰρωτῶν* **a***d*, Stein[2 3] : *εἰρωτέων* **B**, Stein[1] : *ἠρωτῶν* C : *ἐρωτέων* P : *ἐρωτῶν z* || *ἄγοιεν* **B**, Holder, van H. : *διάγοιεν z* 6 *θεωροῖεν* **a** || *καὶ* alt. : *τε καὶ* frag. cod. Paris. || *ἐπήροντο* ibid.

---

5. 22. But this whole anecdote is open to suspicion; it is 'gnomic,' it is told for the sake of an *ἔπος εὖ εἰρημένον*, such as Hdt. loves to close a section of his narrative withal (cp. my notes to 4. 143 f.), as here, the story of Thermopylai - Artemision; and the chronological implication, strictly interpreted, is neither in itself quite acceptable nor quite consistent with 7. 206 *supra*.

2. **βίου τε δεόμενοι**, *victus egentes*: the word **ἐνεργός** may mean simply 'employed,' not necessarily 'employed for hire,' though the word *ἐνεργάζεσθαι* in 1. 93 certainly connotes filthy lucre, and the 'hire' here may be taken for granted. The use of the word in Thuc. 3. 17 does not help us, as the passage is in every way doubtful; but the use *ap.* Xenoph. Platon. *et al.* shows that the word does not necessarily connote wages. Was this Arcadian embassy a political move (*ὀλίγοι τινές*) or simply a mercenary adventure?

4. **εἷς δέ τις πρὸ πάντων**: this circumstantiality would hardly belong to Hdt.'s own method at this stage of the story if he had not found it in his source; natural to the isolated anecdote, it is hardly called for in the body of a work, which has narrated many interviews with the Persian king already. The 'one' in question was presumably 'the son of Artabanos,' named below: *πρό*, 'on behalf of'; cp. Index.

5. **Ὀλύμπια ἄγουσι**: the general synchronism of the invasion with an Olympiad is indubitable, and a cornerstone for the chronology of the war; but the exact coincidence of the festival, or any of its five (?) days (Pindar, *Ol.* 5. 6), with the defence of Thermopylai (7. 206), or with the Arkadian application to the king, is very doubtful, all the more as these two supposed synchronisms conflict with each other! Stein's note, however, on this passage still remains as written under the exploded hypothesis that the Olympiad coincided with the first full moon after the summer solstice, the last day of the festival in 480 B.C. being June 25. He therefore transfers the scene of the Arkadian reception to Therme, maintaining its synchronism with the Olympiad, while rightly dating the defence of Thermopylai to the end of August or beginning of September. But if the synchronism of the Olympiad with the defence of Thermopylai is to be abandoned as an anachronism, why is the Olympiad in this anecdote to be maintained as good chronology? It is surely much more probable that the Arkadian application (assuming the anecdote to have any truth in it) is correctly located at Thermopylai, and correctly dated after the Spartan fiasco there, than that the very substance of the conversation, including the Olympiad synchronism, is precisely and exactly reproduced. However that may be, and not to press the distance from Arkadia to Macedon, the revised calculation for the Olympiad celebrations (Unger, *Philol.* 30, 1874, 227 ff.; A. Mommsen, *Ueber die Zeit der Olympien*, 1891; cp. Busolt, ii.[2] 708) makes the approximate synchronism of Ol. 75, with the scenes laid at Thermopylai, a sufficiently reasonable yet elastic date to cover both cases. Cp. Appendix V. § 4.

6. **καὶ θεωρέοιεν ἀγῶνα γ. καὶ ἱ.**: a similar change of moods (*ἄγουσι· θεωρέοιεν*) in a question is exemplified 5. 13 *τίνες . . εἰσὶ . . καὶ τί . . ἐθέλοντες ἔλθοιεν*, with somewhat less abruptness than in the answer here. The Olympian festival was purely athletic and 'hippic'—not including a 'musical' element (as did the Pythian).

τι [τὸ ἄεθλον] εἴη σφι κείμενον, περὶ ὅτευ ἀγωνίζονται· οἳ δ' εἶπον τῆς ἐλαίης τὸν διδόμενον στέφανον. ἐνθαῦτα εἴπας γνώμην γενναιοτάτην Τιγράνης ὁ Ἀρταβάνου δειλίην ὦφλε πρὸς βασιλέος. πυνθανόμενος γὰρ τὸ ἄεθλον ἐὸν στέφανον ἀλλ' οὐ χρήματα, οὔτε ἠνέσχετο σιγῶν εἶπέ τε ἐς πάντας τάδε. "παπαὶ Μαρδόνιε, κοίους ἐπ' ἄνδρας ἤγαγες μαχησομένους ἡμέας, οἳ οὐ περὶ χρημάτων τὸν ἀγῶνα ποιεῦνται ἀλλὰ περὶ ἀρετῆς." τούτῳ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα εἴρητο.

---

7 *τὸ ἄεθλον* secl. Stein[2]: 'saltem articulus vitiosus est' van H. || *προκείμενον* z || *ὅτεο* R: *ὅτεω* SV (sc. *ὅτεῳ*, cf. Gaisford et 7. 57 supra) 8 *δὲ* **β** || *εἶπον*: *εἶπαν* van H. || *διδόμενον*: *ᾀδόμενον* Valckenaer: *ἀοίδιμον* Naber 9 *τριτανταίχμης* **β**, Holder, van H. || *ὤφλεε* **β** 10 *βασιλέως* C: *βασιλῆος* z || *πυθόμενος* **β**Pz || *τὸν ἄεθλον ἐόντα* **β** 11 *τε*: *δὲ* **β** 12 *τόδε* **β** 13 *τὸν* om. **β** || *ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς* **β**, Holder 14 *ἤρετο* C: *εἴρετο* d

---

8. **τῆς ἐλαίης τὸν διδόμενον στέφανον**: sc. *κεῖσθαι*, or *εἶναι*; the article (*bis*) and the present participle mark the notoriety and the periodicity of this proud yet paltry prize; but the Arkadians presumably did not use exactly this phrase, but simply *ἐλαίης* or *κοτίνου στέφανον*. Cp. Pausanias 5. 15. 3 *κατὰ δὲ τὸν ὀπισθόδομον μάλιστά ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ πεφυκὼς κότινος· καλεῖται δὲ ἐλαία καλλιστέφανος, καὶ τοῖς νικῶσι τὰ Ὀλύμπια καθέστηκεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς δίδοσθαι τοὺς στεφάνους.*

The value of a win is very much under-stated and under-estimated by this anecdote, in the interests of the moral; an Olympian victor obtained substantial rewards and advantages from his own city; cp. K. F. Hermann, *gottesdienst. Alterth.* iii. 50, with reff. (e.g. Plutarch, *Solon* 23; Plato, *Ap.* 36 D, *Rep.* 465 D; Thuc. 4. 121, etc.).

9. **γνώμην γενναιοτάτην**: herein no doubt the key to the fable, which exists for the sake of the moral, as fables always do. These poor men of Arkadia are come to read the proud Persians a lesson on the connexion between *πενίη* and *ἀρετή*; cp. 7. 102. The moralist has, however, nothing to say on the amazing spectacle of a nation's amusing itself at Olympia with the enemy at its very gates; the religious associations prohibit that (but cp. 9. 11); nor, again, of the uselessness of such spectacles and athleticisms for purposes of war; it was left to the Makedonian age to discover the inferiority of athletes to soldiers; cp. Plutarch, *Alex.* 4, *Philopoem.* 3.

Τιγράνης ὁ Ἀρταβάνου. The variant Τ*ριτανταίχμης* many have preferred on the ground, given by Wesseling, that Tigranes, though well known, is nowhere (else) described as a son of Artabanos. But he is described as an Achaimenid, 7. 62, cp. 9. 95, which is enough. Hdt. follows his sources without fully co-ordinating, harmonizing, and relating them. The patronymic here for Tigranes is in itself a valuable evidence for the independence of this anecdote, and of the gnomic source to which it must be referred; cp. Introduction, § 10.

δειλίην ὦφλε: cp. *αἰσχύνην ὀφλεῖν* Thuc. 5. 101. This well-known Atticism does not occur elsewhere in Hdt. (nor indeed in Thucydides either).

11. **οὔτε ἠνέσχετο σιγῶν**: the participial construction is noticeable, cp. 5. 19 *ἀνέχευ ὁρέων τὰ ποιεύμενα*, and the parallel in 1. 206. On the other hand, 7. 139 *καταμείναντες ἀνέσχοντο τὸν ἐπιόντα ἐπὶ τὴν χώρην δέξασθαι* is obviously a different construction.

ἐς πάντας: *coram omnibus* (Baehr) = *ἐς μέσον*.

13. **οὐ περὶ χρημάτων . . ἀλλὰ περὶ ἀρετῆς.** *χρήματα* and *ἀρετή* are not quite co-ordinate in this passage; the slight inconsequence only sharpens the gnome. *περὶ ἀρετῆς* = *τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα*. Baehr observes that the speaker utters a thoroughly Greek sentiment: Stein adds, one worthy of his sire! ("spricht ganz im Geiste seines Vaters"). Such observations, however, go to illustrate not so much the spread of Hellenic culture and ethos among the Asiatics as the literary

Ἐν δὲ τῷ διὰ μέσου χρόνῳ, ἐπείτε τὸ ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι 27
τρῶμα ἐγεγόνεε, αὐτίκα Θεσσαλοὶ πέμπουσι κήρυκα ἐς Φωκέας, ἅτε σφι ἔχοντες αἰεὶ χόλον, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ὑστάτου τρώματος καὶ τὸ κάρτα. ἐσβαλόντες γὰρ πανστρατιῇ αὐτοί τε οἱ

---

27. 1 ἐπείτε: ἐπεὶ τάχιστα **B** 2 κήρυκας **B** 3 ἔχοντες **a**R: ἐνέχοντες SVz, van H.

---

mechanism of Hellenic logography. 'The distinguished foreigner' as a vehicle for national sentiment, whether praise or blame be the object in view, seems to have been a Greek invention; cp. 4. 77, 142; 7. 9, 236, etc.

27. 1. ἐν δὲ τῷ . . αὐτίκα, 'meanwhile, immediately after the occurrence of the disaster in Thermopylai'; i.e. before the transactions narrated in cc. 23–26.

2. **Θεσσαλοὶ . . ἐς Φωκέας.** The χόλος between Thessalians and Phokians was even more deadly than the ἔχθρη between Athens and Aigina; cp. 7. 145, where nothing is said of any attempt to compose this quarrel at the Isthmus. (Hdt. does not co-ordinate his materials fully.) The word χόλος has a more physical and concrete ring in it than ἔχθρη. The antiquity of the feud between Thessalian and Phokian is exhibited in 7. 176 *supra*. That it is less in evidence during the fifth century is perhaps rather an accident of our sources than a proof of mutual goodwill, save that Phokians and Thessalians may have had, to some extent, a common friend in Athens. (In the fourth century the short-lived supremacy of Phokis was in great part maintained by the division of Thessaly against itself; cp. Bury, *Hist. of Greece*, ii. 281 ff.)

3. **τρώματος**: an awkward iteration after τρῶμα just above. **καὶ τὸ κάρτα,** 'very specially,' 7. 16, 4. 181, etc.

4. **γάρ** explains and introduces an account of τὸ ὕστατον τρῶμα. The exact date of this affair is not to be extracted from the phrase οὐ πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον ταύτης τῆς βασιλέος στρατηλασίης. It would be interesting to know who the σύμμαχοι were, or whether that word points to anything more than τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Θεσσαλῶν. The account in Hdt. is neither quite complete nor perhaps quite accurate. He records two victories of the Phokians over the Thessalians, the more recent one apparently on Parnassos, a πεζομαχία, a νυκτομαχία, and apparently a sortie of a besieged force, resulting in a great victory, due to a ruse or stratagem devised by their Eleian diviner Tellias. This great victory is commemorated, according to Hdt., by splendid offerings at Delphi and at Abai. The other victory, in the pass by Hyampolis, and at a previous date, where they discomfit the Thessalian cavalry, also by a stratagem or ruse, the authorship of which is not specified (c. 28 *infra*), appears of less moment, and is not especially commemorated at Delphi, or even at Abai, in the immediate neighbourhood; otherwise, despite Hdt.'s assertion, we might have been tempted to conjecture that the *anathema* at Abai was in reality a commemoration of the victory at Hyampolis.

Polyainos 6. 18 narrates the two Phokian stratagems against the Thessalians in the same order as Hdt., without adding any point, and even omitting the Eleian *mantis*. Pausanias in the *Phokika* (10. 1) gives a much fuller account of these transactions. According to the *Periegete* there were four battles, the second and third of which are not represented by anything in Hdt., while the first and fourth correspond to the two engagements in Hdt., restored to their proper order. Pausanias records first (i.) the battle by Hyampolis, and the disaster to the Thessalian cavalry caused by the concealed jars (c. 28 *infra*). It appears, however, to be an indecisive affair, for (ii.) the Thessalians at once prepare to invade Phokis on a far larger scale (συνελέχθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων πασῶν), a project which strikes terror into the Phokians, especially as the cavalry is chiefly in evidence. After consulting the Delphic oracle they despatch, under cover of night, 300 picked men, led by Gelon, to reconnoitre; but this force is trampled and cut to pieces by the Thessalian cavalry. (iii.) This disaster leads to a desperate resolve: the Phokians determine to conquer or to die, after devoting withal their wives, children, and all their properties to the flames. ἀντὶ τούτου μὲν ἅπαντα τὰ

Θεσσαλοὶ καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι αὐτῶν ἐς τοὺς Φωκέας, οὐ πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον ταύτης τῆς βασιλέος στρατηλασίης, ἐσσώθησαν

---

6 βασιλέως C : βασιλῆος z || ἐσώθησαν **B**

ἀνάλγητα βουλεύματα ἀπόνοια ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων ὀνομάζεται Φωκική. The Phokians march out under two generals, an Ambrosian named Rhoios and Daiphantes of Hyampolis, the former in command of the infantry, the latter of the horse. This expedition is accompanied by Tellias of Elis, on whom the hopes of the Phokians were fixed. The result of their desperate courage was a brilliant victory, and the oracle was justified; but where exactly the battle took place, and what service on the occasion Tellias performed, is not specified. The same story is told, with some important additions, by Plutarch, *Mor.* 244; see notes to c. 29 *infra.* (iv.) Subsequently, when the two armies were laagered opposite each other, *περὶ τὴν ἐς τὴν Φωκίδα ἐσβολήν*, the stratagem of Tellias came off. Taking advantage of a full moon, 500 picked men, their arms and persons whitened with chalk, surprised the Thessalians, and slew an immense number. Pausanias describes two monuments at Delphi as records of these events. One he connects with the great but anonymous Phokian victory, (iii.) *supra.* *ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ ἀναθήματα οἱ Φωκεῖς ἀπέστειλαν ἐς Δελφοὺς Ἀπόλλωνι Τελλίαν τε τὸν μάντιν καὶ ὅσοι μαχομένοις ἄλλοι σφίσιν ἐστρατήγησαν, σὺν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἥρωας τῶν ἐπιχωρίων· ἔργα δὲ αἱ εἰκόνες Ἀριστομέδοντός εἰσιν Ἀργείου* (10. 1. 10). Another notice of Phokian *anathemata* occurs in a different connexion, not free from ambiguity. *εἰσὶ καὶ εἰκόνες χαλκαῖ Φωκέων ἀναθέντων, ἡνίκα δευτέρᾳ συμβολῇ τὸ ἱππικὸν ἐτρέψαντο τὸ ἐκ Θεσσαλίας . . Ἡρακλῆς δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλων ἔχονται τοῦ τρίποδος καὶ ἐς μάχην περὶ αὐτοῦ καθίστανται· Λητὼ μὲν δὴ καὶ Ἄρτεμις Ἀπόλλωνα, Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ Ἡρακλέα ἐπέχουσι τοῦ θυμοῦ. Φωκέων καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀνάθημα, ὅτε σφίσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς Θεσσαλοὺς Τελλίας ἡγήσατο Ἠλεῖος. τὰ μὲν δὴ ἄλλα ἀγάλματα Δίυλλός τε ἐν κοινῷ καὶ Ἀμυκλαῖος, τὴν δὲ Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ Ἄρτεμιν Χίονίς ἐστι εἰργασμένος· Κορινθίους δὲ εἶναί φασιν αὐτούς* (10. 13. 7).

Assuming that the first group here mentioned was identical with the *anathema* previously described, there were, according to Pausanias, at Delphi only two groups commemorating Phokian victories over Thessalians. (*a*) There was the work of Aristomedon of Argos, which represented Tellias, Rhoios, Daiphantes, and possibly other *στρατηγοί* (Gelon, for example?), together with certain local Phokian heroes. This commemorated the great victory over the Thessalian cavaliers, numbered (iii.) above, but not recorded by Hdt. at all: these figures were apparently of bronze. (*b*) There was the group, various figures in which had been wrought by Diyllos, Amyklaios, and Chionis, all Korinthians, to commemorate apparently the success enumerated as (iv.) above, and identical with the *πεζομαχία* of Hdt. in which the ruse of Tellias the Eleian was brilliantly successful. This anathema represented a contest between Herakles and Apollon for possession of the divining stool or tripod, Leto and Artemis supporting Apollon, and Athena backing Herakles. To this group Hdt. apparently refers.

Though Pausanias is more explicit than Hdt., it by no means follows that we are to adopt his account of the war *simpliciter*; nor is a partial harmony between the two out of compass. Hdt. records two Phokian victories over the Thessalians and but one Delphian monument, the work apparently of the Korinthian school, and commemorating the night battle, which, though he describes it first, he has previously introduced as *τὸ ὕστατον τρῶμα.* On this point, then, Hdt. and Pausanias are at one. For the victory which he records over the Thessalian cavalry Hdt. mentions no monument. Pausanias, however, also, on his own showing, is a monument short, for he records three Phokian victories over the Thessalians, two of them victories over the cavalry, and has but two monuments to describe, the one commemorating a victory over the Thessalian cavalry 'in a second engagement'—plainly the one numbered (iii.) above—a victory, the story of which is, on the face of it, as above indicated, full of improbabilities. The solution lies near, that Pausanias (or his source) has duplicated the victory over the Thessalian cavalry. There was only one victory over the cavalry, as

ὑπὸ τῶν Φωκέων καὶ περιέφθησαν τρηχέως. ἐπείτε γὰρ κατειλήθησαν ἐς τὸν Παρνησὸν οἱ Φωκέες ἔχοντες μάντιν Τελλίην τὸν Ἠλεῖον, ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Τελλίης οὗτος σοφίζεται αὐτοῖσι τοιόνδε. γυψώσας ἄνδρας ἑξακοσίους τῶν Φωκέων τοὺς ἀρίστους, αὐτούς τε τούτους καὶ τὰ ὅπλα αὐτῶν, νυκτὸς ἐπεθήκατο τοῖσι Θεσσαλοῖσι, προείπας αὐτοῖσι, τὸν ἂν μὴ λευκανθίζοντα ἴδωνται, τοῦτον κτείνειν. τούτους ὦν αἵ τε φυλακαὶ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν πρῶται ἰδοῦσαι ἐφοβήθησαν, δόξασαι ἄλλο τι εἶναι τέρας, καὶ μετὰ τὰς φυλακὰς αὐτὴ ἡ στρατιὴ οὕτω ὥστε τετρακισχιλίων κρατῆσαι νεκρῶν καὶ ἀσπίδων

---

8 *παρνησσὸν* **B**Pz 13 *λευκανθίζοντα* A^2P*dz*: *λευκαθίζοντα* (*λευκανθέντα* malit van H.) 14 *πρῶται τῶν Θεσσαλῶν* S || *ἰδοῦσαι* om. R 15 *τέρας* mihi suspectum 16 *ὥστε καὶ τρισχιλίων* **B**

---

described by Hdt. and by Pausanias himself, (i.) *supra*; it was in honour of this victory that the group by Aristomedon of Argos was dedicated, and we may fairly conjecture that the stratagem by which the cavalry was discomfited was due to the ingenuity of Tellias. The error in Pausanias can even be explained. As Hdt. had recorded this engagement without assigning a monument to it, a victory had to be invented in order to account for the presence of a second monument at Delphi. The omission by Hdt. of any mention of the monument is no doubt a difficulty; but a monument there was.

The only crux remaining is the occurrence in Pausanias of the disaster to the Phokians under Gelon, omitted by Hdt. This episode has an air of verisimilitude, and need not be dismissed as merely a set-off to the victory of the 'Six Hundred.' Its omission by Hdt. is easily accounted for by the consideration that he is merely describing the grievances of the Thessalians against the Phokians, a list from which Thessalian victories might fairly be omitted. A combination, then, gives a more complete and a more correct view of the war than either source taken alone. The war comprised three great episodes: (i.) A Phokian victory over the Thessalian cavalry, commemorated at Delphi by the group above described as the work of the Argive, Aristomedon. (ii.) A Thessalian victory over the Phokians, under Gelon; probably a much more extensive affair than the record suggests. (iii.) A second Phokian victory, due, like the first, chiefly to a stratagem devised by Tellias, and commemorated at Delphi in the group wrought by the Korinthian school.

7. **περιέφθησαν τρηχέως**: c. 18 *supra*.

8. **κατειλήθησαν ἐς τὸν Παρνησόν**: cp. 9. 31 *περὶ τὸν Παρνησσὸν* (*sic*) *κατειλημένοι*. Parnassos appears below, c. 32, as the natural refuge of the Phokians (from the east and north sides); its position is further defined in c. 35 *infra*, and in c. 36 it appears as the natural refuge for the Delphians (from the south and west sides), rising indeed immediately over the Holy Place (cp. c. 39).

μάντιν Τελλίην τὸν Ἠλεῖον. Eleans are in great demand as seers and diviners; cp. 9. 37, where a member of the same clan appears. This divine is a 'sophist' in a way; with **σοφίζεται** cp. *σοφίζεσθαι* 3. 111.

10. **γυψώσας**: a treatment accorded in Aithiopia to corpses and warriors, 3. 24; cp. 7. 69.

ἑξακοσίους: Pausanias *l.c.* cuts them down to 500.

11. **νυκτός.** Pausanias *l.c.* supplies the moon, which is necessary for the due effect. The whitening of the hoplites had a double purpose: it enabled them to discriminate friend and foe (often a difficult matter in night-attacks, cp. Thucyd. 7. 43); and it struck terror into the Thessalians, who mistook them for ghosts.

15. **τέρας** is either exegetical, as though we read *καὶ δὴ καὶ τέρας* (cp. 4. 179 *ἄλλην τε ἑκατόμβην καὶ δὴ καὶ τρίποδα*), or else spurious.

16. **τετρακισχιλίων**: this item is probably authentic, but suggests that the

Φωκέας, τῶν τὰς μὲν ἡμισέας ἐς Ἄβας ἀνέθεσαν τὰς δὲ ἐς Δελφούς· ἡ δὲ δεκάτη ἐγένετο τῶν χρημάτων ἐκ ταύτης τῆς μάχης οἱ μεγάλοι ἀνδριάντες οἱ περὶ τὸν τρίποδα συνεστεῶτες ἔμπροσθε τοῦ νηοῦ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖσι, καὶ ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι ἐν
28 Ἄβῃσι ἀνακέαται. ταῦτα μέν νυν τὸν πεζὸν ἐργάσαντο τῶν Θεσσαλῶν οἱ Φωκέες πολιορκέοντας ἑωυτούς· ἐσβαλοῦσαν δὲ ἐς τὴν χώρην τὴν ἵππον αὐτῶν ἐλυμήναντο ἀνηκέστως. ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἐσβολῇ ἥ ἐστι κατὰ Ὑάμπολιν, ἐν ταύτῃ τάφρον μεγάλην ὀρύξαντες ἀμφορέας κενεοὺς ἐς αὐτὴν κατέθηκαν, χοῦν

---

17 ἡμισέας ἀσπίδας **B** 19 τοῦ τρίποδος **B** 20 ἔμπροσθεν **B**z 21 ἀνακέεται **B**: num genuina sunt verba καὶ . . ἀνακέαται? **28.** 1 εἰργάσαντο CPSz 2 πολιορκέοντες z: 'fortasse πολιορκέοντα' Stein[1] 4 ὑάνπολιν **a** 5 κεινοὺς **B**, Holder, van H.

---

attack was not confined to the 500–600 *λευκανθίζοντες*, but supplemented by the Phokians *en masse*. Perhaps there were many more shields than corpses; it is not likely that the numbers were identical: **τῶν**, indeed, refers only to *ἀσπίδων*.

18. **ἡ δὲ δεκάτη**: a tithe of the spoil to Delphi, or the gods, was a matter of course—hence the article; cp. 7. 132 *δεκατεῦσαι*.

τῶν χρημάτων: the shields not included apparently.

19. **οἱ μεγάλοι ἀνδριάντες οἱ περὶ τὸν τρίποδα συνεστεῶτες**: these words are translated by Rawlinson (iv.[3] 280) "the gigantic figures which stand round the tripod"—and so the older commentators, and L. & S. The accusative with *περί* favours this rendering, but on the other hand the meaning given to *συνεστεῶτες* is highly objectionable: *συνεστάναι*, *συστῆναι* meaning with Hdt. constantly *stare cum aliquo, sed non ab eadem parte verum a parte opposita, pugnare, contendere cum aliquo* (Schweighaeuser, *Lexicon*). So c. 79 *infra*, 6. 108; cp. 7. 142; and with more metaphorical sense, 7. 142, 170, c. 74 *infra*, 9. 89. Further, the description of the work here in question makes it clear that the subject of this group of statuary was a contest between Herakles and Apollon for 'the tripod,' which further proves that the tripod here mentioned is not, for example, the tripod which stood on the *τρικάρηνος ὄφις* 9. 81 (cp. c. 82 *infra*), but the Delphian divining stool, represented in the bronze. This mention of the monument suggests the probable source of Hdt.'s digression on the Thessalo-Phokian war, which is apparently an addition to the first draft of his history, made after his visit to Delphi; cp. Introduction, § 9.

20. **ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι ἐν Ἄβῃσι ἀνακέαται.** If this statement is correct, they must have been restorations, or dedications later than the Persian war, for Abai was sacked and destroyed by fire, c. 33 *infra*.

28. 1. **τὸν πεζὸν . . πολιορκέοντας ἑωυτούς**: the construction is paralleled 7. 40 *στρατὸς . . οὐ διακεκριμένοι*, 7. 196 *ὁ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς . . ἀπίκοντο ἐς Ἀφέτας*. Thuc. 6. 61. 2 *στρατιὰ Λακεδαιμονίων . . πρὸς Βοιωτούς τι πράσσοντες* (Stein). Yet none of these passages is quite so harsh as the present. Was the plural a correction to avoid the hiatus? The reading is found in both families of MSS. *ἑωυτούς* of course refers to *Φωκέες*, but is barely correct.

3. **ἐλυμήναντο ἀνηκέστως.** *λυμαίνεσθαι* is found c. 15 *supra*, and both words in 6. 12 *λυμαίνεται λύμῃσι ἀνηκέστοισι*.

4. **τῇ ἐσβολῇ ἥ ἐστι κατὰ Ὑάμπολιν**: Hyampolis appears again c. 33 in close connexion with Elateia, Parapotamioi, Abai; see note *ad l.* The pass here named is undoubtedly the main route from the valley of the Kephisos into Opûs, and so on through Thermopylai. The Persians must have come down through this pass into Phokis and Boiotia, as well as by the pass indicated c. 31 *infra*.

τάφρον μεγάλην: the author of this device must have been Tellias the Eleian diviner; cp. c. 27 *supra*.

δὲ ἐπιφορήσαντες καὶ ὁμοιώσαντες τῷ ἄλλῳ χώρῳ ἐδέκοντο
τοὺς Θεσσαλοὺς ἐσβάλλοντας. οἱ δὲ ὡς ἀναρπασόμενοι τοὺς
Φωκέας φερόμενοι ἐσέπεσον ἐς τοὺς ἀμφορέας. ἐνθαῦτα οἱ
ἵπποι τὰ σκέλεα διεφθάρησαν. τούτων δή σφι ἀμφοτέρων **29**
ἔχοντες ἔγκοτον οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ πέμψαντες κήρυκα ἠγόρευον
τάδε. "ὦ Φωκέες, ἤδη τι μᾶλλον γνωσιμαχέετε μὴ εἶναι
ὅμοιοι ἡμῖν. πρόσθε τε γὰρ ἐν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι, ὅσον χρόνον
ἐκεῖνα ἡμῖν ἥνδανε, πλέον αἰεί κοτε ὑμέων ἐφερόμεθα· νῦν τε
παρὰ τῷ βαρβάρῳ τοσοῦτο δυνάμεθα ὥστε ἐπ' ἡμῖν ἐστι τῆς
γῆς ἐστερῆσθαι καὶ πρὸς ἠνδραποδίσθαι ὑμέας. ἡμεῖς μέντοι

---

7 *ἐσβάλλοντας* A : *ἐσβαλόντας* B : *ἐσβαλέοντας* **β** 8 *ἐνέπεσον* **β**
29. 4 *ὁμοῖοι* CPz || *πρόσθεν* **α** 5 *αἰεί* : *εἴ* **β** 6 *τοσούτω* **β** || *ὥστε* **α** : *ἐστὲ* **β** (Holder) || *ἐστι* : *ἐστὲ* S (Gaisf.) 7 *γῆς* **τε β**, Holder, van H. || *προσηνδραποδίσθαι* CPSz || *ἡμεῖς* : *ἡμέες* **β**

---

6. **ἐδέκοντο** : a decided imperfect.
7. **ὡς ἀναρπασόμενοι** : *ibidem* 9. 60.
8. **οἱ ἵπποι τὰ σκέλεα διεφθάρησαν** : with the construction (accusative of 'reference,' or limitation) cp. 1. 38 *τὸν γὰρ δὴ ἕτερον διεφθαρμένον τὴν ἀκοὴν οὐκ εἶναί μοι λογίζομαι*, and Index. But in this case the breaking of the horses' legs must have meant total destruction of horse and man. On this battle see notes to previous chapter.

29. 2. **ἔγκοτον** : 9. 110, 6. 133. The word is properly an adjective. The substantive *κότος* is used by Homer and Aischylos, and this word as adj. by the latter.

οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ πέμψαντες κήρυκα resumes the thread of the story from c. 27, for the year 480 B.C.

3. **γνωσιμαχέετε μὴ εἶναι ὅμοιοι ἡμῖν**, 'recognize your inferiority to us.' The Thessalians themselves appear as *γνωσιμαχέοντες* (in the king's opinion) 7. 130; see note *ad l.* *ὅμοιοι prima facie* here in war; but as there had been a political subordination of the Phokians, for a time at least, to the Thessalians, the connotation of the word may be extended. Plutarch, *de mulier. v.* 2 = *Mor.* 244, records a rising of the Lokrians against the *ἄρχοντες* and *τύραννοι* in their cities who were apparently dependents of the Thessalians, while the Thessalians retorted with the butchery of 250 Phokian hostages, and the invasion of Phokis, which resulted in the Phokian victory at Kleonai, just above Hyampolis, as described by Hdt. in the previous c. and by Pausanias, as above quoted, c. 27 (i.) and (iii.).

5. **ἐκεῖνα** = *τὰ ἐκείνων* : cp. 2. 39 *κεφαλῇ κείνῃ* = *τῇ κείνου*, 2. 40 *κοιλίην μὲν κείνην πᾶσαν ἐξ ὧν εἷλον*, 5. 82 *ἱρωτάτας δὴ κείνας νομίζοντες εἶναι* (sc. *τὰς ἐλαίας τὰς ἐκείνων*). With the neuter article cp. *τὰ Ἑλλήνων* c. 30, *τὰ Μήδων* c. 34 *infra* (Stein).

πλέον αἰεί κοτε ὑμέων ἐφερόμεθα : cp. *πλέον ἔχειν τινός* 7. 168, 211, 9. 70. Stein sees in this phrase a possible reference to the first Sacred War (595–4 to 586–5 B.C.) in which the Thessalians, under Eurylochos the Aleuad, played a prominent part; the reference would be absolutely unique, for nowhere else in the work of Hdt., not even in the passages on Kleisthenes of Sikyon, the Alkmaionidai, Solon, is there the slightest hint of the great subject. One must ruefully acquiesce in the alternative that the reference is, at most, to the general superiority of the Thessalians to the Phokians in the Delphic or Pylian Amphiktyony—albeit that would unconsciously cover the case of the Sacred War. On Eurylochos the Thessalian cp. Strabo 418.

6. **ἐπ' ἡμῖν ἐστι** : cp. 7. 10 *ἐπ' ἀνδρί γε ἑνὶ πάντα τὰ βασιλέος πρήγματα γεγενῆσθαι.* **ὥστε** with the indicative "expresses the actual (or potential?) result with emphasis" (L. & S.). Cp. 3. 12 *αἱ μὲν τῶν Περσέων κεφαλαί εἰσι ἀσθενέες οὕτω ὥστε εἰ θέλεις ψήφῳ μούνῃ βαλεῖν, διατετρανέεις.* The passive construction (*ἐστερῆσθαι· ἠνδραποδίσθαι*) is

τὸ πᾶν ἔχοντες οὐ μνησικακέομεν, ἀλλ' ἡμῖν γενέσθω ἀντ' αὐτῶν πεντήκοντα τάλαντα ἀργυρίου, καὶ ὑμῖν ὑποδεκόμεθα τὰ
30 *ἐπιόντα ἐπὶ τὴν χώρην ἀποτρέψειν." ταῦτά σφι ἐπαγγέλλοντο οἱ Θεσσαλοί. οἱ γὰρ Φωκέες μοῦνοι τῶν ταύτῃ ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἐμήδιζον, κατ' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος εὑρίσκω, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Θεσσαλῶν· εἰ δὲ Θεσσαλοὶ*

---

9 *αὐτέων* R || *ἐπιδεκόμεθα* **β** 10 *ἐπιόντα* om. **β** **30.** 1 *ἐπηγγέλλοντο* **α** 3 *ἄλλον* R 4 *κατὰ*: *μετὰ* C || *ἔχθος τὸ*: *ἔχθος τῶν* Sz

---

remarkable, as well as the highly rhetorical perfect tense.

8. **τὸ πᾶν ἔχοντες οὐ μνησικακέομεν** is curious, if not ambiguous. Baehr takes *τὸ πᾶν ἔχοντες* together, *omnem potestatem habentes.* Cp. 7. 162 *οὐδὲν ὑπιέντες ἔχειν τὸ πᾶν ἐθέλετε.* But Stein's exegesis, *τὸ πᾶν ἔχοντες* sc. *μνησικακῆσαι*, suits the present context better, albeit Demosthenes *de cor.* 96 (*τῶν τότε Ἀθηναίων πόλλ' ἂν ἐχόντων μνησικακῆσαι Κορινθίοις*), being perfectly simple and lucid, is not an exact parallel. It is *τὸ πᾶν*, rather than the suppression of the infinitive, which causes the ambiguity here; there *πολλά* is simpler than *τὸ πᾶν* and the infinitive after *ἔχειν* is expressed.

ἀντ' αὐτῶν, 'in return for what you have done'; or perhaps, 'instead of what you deserve.' For this vague *αὐτά* cp. 7. 8, 14 etc.

9. **τὰ ἐπιόντα**: cp. 7. 138, 157 *τὸν ἐπιόντα.* The neuter plural is certainly more appropriate here.

30. 1. **ἐπαγγέλλοντο**: simply on their own account, and not speaking with any authority from the Persian, but through their own messenger. Repeated in **ἐπαγγελλομένων** just below; on the word cp. 7. 1.

2. **τῶν ταύτῃ ἀνθρώπων.** The phrase doubtless covers the Lokrians, the Dorians, and other tribes or peoples of the neighbourhood; but Hdt. at least cannot mean to include the Delphians under it, though others might be tempted to do so.

3. **ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος εὑρίσκω**: cp. *ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν* just below. Hdt. accepts, nay invites, full responsibility for the very unfavourable verdict on the Phokians at this crisis, enforcing it by the disparaging **ἀνθρώπων** just before. He wholly discounts, in fact, and discredits the spirited and patriotic reply of the Phokians, which he faithfully proceeds to report, as he has previously reported their actual service on the Greek side, 7. 203, 218, a service not very efficient, according to his showing. Hdt.'s attitude towards the Thessalians appears in contrast strongly favourable: according to him they, in the first instance, espoused the Greek cause, and only afterwards 'medized' under 'necessity'; cp. 7. 172. Pausanias 10. 1 contradicts Hdt. by representing the Phokians as in the first instance compounding with the Persians, and afterwards reverting to the national cause. This representation of the case might be due to an inference from the conduct of the Thessalians, as reported by Hdt., coupled with the judgement of Hdt. in the present passage. Or could there be any connexion between the conduct of the Phokians and the policy and fortunes of Delphi? The Phokians at least talked big, or reported themselves as so doing; but their positive services to the Greek cause are not very clear. If Delphi escaped their fate, its escape may have been due to the very different attitude of the Thessalians (and other medizing states) to Phokis and to the Amphiktyonic shrine. Considering how decidedly Hdt. 'atticizes,' his attitude towards the Phokians is the more remarkable. Should it be connected with *τὸν ἱερὸν καλούμενον πόλεμον* in 448 B.C. (cp. Thuc. 1. 112. 5; Busolt III. i. 419 ff.)?

4. **κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Θεσσαλῶν**: the preposition = *ob, propter*, as in 7. 136 *κατὰ ταῦτα ἥκειν*, 9. 15 *κατὰ ἔχθος αὐτῶν* (just as here), 9. 109 *κατ' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν* (as here, above) *φοβεόμενος δὲ Ἄμηστριν μή κτλ.* The genitive is 'objective'; cp. 9. 38 *ἐθύετό τε καὶ προεθυμέετο κατά τε τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ κατὰ τὸ κέρδος.*

τὰ Ἑλλήνων ηὖξον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐμήδιζον ἂν οἱ Φωκέες. ταῦτα ἐπαγγελλομένων Θεσσαλῶν, οὔτε δώσειν ἔφασαν χρήματα, παρέχειν τέ σφι Θεσσαλοῖσι ὁμοίως μηδίζειν, εἰ ἄλλως βουλοίατο· ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἔσεσθαι ἑκόντες εἶναι προδόται τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνηνείχθησαν οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι, οὕτω δὴ οἱ **31**
Θεσσαλοὶ κεχολωμένοι τοῖσι Φωκεῦσι ἐγένοντο ἡγεμόνες τῷ βαρβάρῳ τῆς ὁδοῦ. ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς Τρηχινίης ἐς τὴν Δωρίδα

---

5 αὖξον van H. || δοκέει S, Cobet: δοκεῖ van H. 6 ἔφασαν· χρήματα **α** 7 παρέχειν τέ **B**z: τε παρέχειν ceteri || σφι: σφίσιν Stein(1)2, van H. **31.** 1 ἐπεὶ δὲ δὴ **B** 2 φωκεεῦσι **α** || ἐγίνοντο **B** 3 τρηχίνης R

---

7. **παρέχειν** is impersonal; cp. c. 8 *supra*; the tense must be at least imperfect; a pluperfect would have been acceptable.

Θεσσαλοῖσι ὁμοίως μηδίζειν has the sharper point as a reply to *μὴ εἶναι ὅμοιοι ἡμῖν* in the Thessalian message, c. 29 *supra*.

ἄλλως, 'on independent grounds'; i.e. it would not in any case have been for the purpose of conciliating the Thessalians.

8. **οὐκ ἔσεσθαι ἑκόντες εἶναι**: the idiomatic *εἶναι* in 7. 104, 164, 9. 7, but here rather odd after *ἔσεσθαι*.

προδόται τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 'like the Thessalians,' *subaud.*: a dangerous taunt. The Phokian language is somewhat grandiloquent in view of their performance above Thermopylai, 7. 218, and sits better (if not quite discreetly) on the lips of Athens later on (c. 144 *infra*).

31. 1. **οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι** can only refer to the short reply, of less than three lines, just preceding; perhaps that is to be regarded only as a summary of a longer reply, or speeches: **ἀνηνείχθησαν**, were 'reported.'

2. **κεχολωμένοι**: no doubt specifically by the title of 'traitors' just flung at them. Hdt. is rich in terms for the Thessalo-Phokian feud: *ἔχοντες αἰεὶ χόλον* c. 27, *ἔχοντες ἔγκοτον* c. 29, *τὸ ἔχθος* c. 30.

ἡγεμόνες . . τῆς ὁδοῦ: cp. 7. 197 *οἱ κατηγεμόνες τῆς ὁδοῦ*, where *ὁδός* is abstract, or conceptual.

τῷ βαρβάρῳ: sc. *τῷ βασιλέι*, or *τοῖς Πέρσῃσι*.

3. **ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς Τρηχινίης ἐς τὴν Δωρίδα**: one of the most luminous hints in the record. The term clearly implies and only applies to a pass west of and at right angles to Thermopylai, and roughly parallel to *τῇ ἐσβολῇ ἣ ἐστὶ κατὰ Ὑάμπολιν* mentioned up above incidentally, c. 28. This western pass (running north and south) led over from the plain of the Spercheios and the Asopos to the upper plain of the Kephisos, and so to Delphi, and further. It has been identified above, 7. 176, notes, with *ἡ διὰ Τρηχῖνος ἔσοδος ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα*, a formula which Hdt. himself apparently (mis)applies to Thermopylai. However that may be, in the present context Hdt. undoubtedly carries the whole Persian land-forces by this route, and by this route alone, from the banks of the Spercheios to the banks of the Kephisos. That is a manifestly absurd proceeding. One Persian column, of course, marched by Thermopylai, Kleonai, Hyampolis, and so forth. But what we have here to be thankful for is the clear indication that another column (probably more lightly equipped) made its way direct from Trachis into Doris. The cavalry may all have passed by the easier route to Hyampolis (cp. the Thessalian case c. 28 *supra*). There is no clear indication of the continued tripartition of the Persian forces (unless c. 34 contains it obscurely), but probably the system was maintained (unless one whole *corps d'armée* had remained behind in Makedon and Thrace). Perhaps while one column crossed by the Asopos-gorge or Trachinian pass, and another followed the coast-route and then turned inland to Hyampolis, a third may have made its way across the hills, between the two, by the modern *Boudonitza*—then, as now, a sufficiently

ἐσέβαλον· τῆς γὰρ Δωρίδος χώρης ποδεὼν στεινὸς ταύτῃ κατατείνει, ὡς τριήκοντα σταδίων μάλιστά κῃ εὖρος, κείμενος μεταξὺ τῆς τε Μηλίδος καὶ Φωκίδος χώρης, ἥ περ ἦν τὸ παλαιὸν Δρυοπίς· ἡ δὲ χώρη αὕτη ἐστὶ μητρόπολις Δωριέων τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ. ταύτην ὦν τὴν Δωρίδα γῆν οὐκ ἐσίναντο ἐσβαλόντες οἱ βάρβαροι· ἐμήδιζόν τε γὰρ καὶ οὐκ
32 *ἐδόκεε Θεσσαλοῖσι. ὡς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Δωρίδος ἐς τὴν Φωκίδα ἐσέβαλον, αὐτοὺς μὲν τοὺς Φωκέας οὐκ αἱρέουσι. οἱ μὲν γὰρ*

---

5 *τριάκοντα* **B** 6 *μηλίδος* **B** : *μηλιάδος* || *καὶ τῆς* Sz || *ἥ* : *ἧι* **a** : *ἧ* **B** 7 *δρυοπίης* **B** **32.** 1 *δὲ* : *δ'* **a**

---

easy route (as I found to my own satisfaction in 1899).

4. **τῆς γὰρ Δωρίδος χώρης ποδεὼν στεινὸς ταύτῃ κατατείνει**, 'for there is a narrow neck, or strip, of the Dorian land (Doris) stretching down in this quarter'—to the vale of the Kephisos. Hdt. appears to give an extension to 'Doris' which would make it include not merely the higher ground of the Dorian tetrapolis but the head streams of the upper Kephisos valley. K. O. Mueller, *Orchomenos*[2] (1844) p. 486, observes that Pindos (= Dorion, Aischin. *de f. L.* 286. 2), Boion, Kytinion, Erineon formed the Dorian tetrapolis, properly so called: Lilaia, Karphaia (= Skarphaia), and Dryope, "if there ever was a town of this name," were 'Dorian' in 480 B.C. (Schol. Pindar *Pyth.* 1. 121, Tzetz. *Lyk.* 980), and constitute the *στεινὸς ποδεών* here described. For *ποδεών* cp. 2. 121. Stein remarks that the forms *Δρυοπαῖος*, *Δρυπαῖος* on Delphian inscripp. implies a township *Δρυόπη*.

6. **ἥ περ ἦν τὸ παλαιὸν Δρυοπίς.** These words must refer to the whole *Δωρὶς χώρη*, and have the air of a gloss, which has crept into the text, and at an awkward place: in any case they should follow the *Δωρίδος χώρης* and not the *Φωκίδος χώρης*. Cp. c. 43 *infra*.

7. **μητρόπολις Δωριέων τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ**: a memorable note, marking Dryopis-Doris as the last station in the chart of the Dorian wandering before the invasion of the Peloponnesos and 'the return of the Herakleidai'; cp. c. 43 *infra*. Whether Hdt. is right in bringing all the Dorians in the Peloponnesos from this 'metropolis' (and apparently by one route? at one time?) is a further question, or group of questions, too large to discuss here in a note. It seems, however, that the Legend of the Return lay completely developed before Hdt.; cp. 9. 26 *infra*. The fact that the name of the Dorians attaches itself to this Dryopis, and to this place alone on the whole map of Greece, is at least proof of a genuinely Dorian character in the folk of that place. In 457 B.C. the Phokians invaded *Δωριᾶς τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων μητρόπολιν Βοιὸν καὶ Κυτίνιον καὶ Ἐρινεόν* Thuc. 1. 107. 2, and in 426 B.C. *ξυνεπρεσβεύοντο δὲ αὐτοῖς* (sc. *Τραχινίοις*) *καὶ Δωριῆς ἡ μητρόπολις τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων* Thuc. 3. 92. 3. This application led to the foundation of Herakleia, the fortress which commanded the road from Trachis into Doris, used by the Persians in 480 B.C. In Amphiktyonic inscripp. the official title of these Dorians is *Δωριεῖς οἱ ἐκ τῆς Μητροπόλεως*, Buergel, *Amphictyonie* (1887) p. 29.

8. **οὐκ ἐσίναντο ἐσβαλόντες**, 'they entered it, but they did it no harm,' for two reasons: (1) the Dorians 'medized,' (2) the Thessalians disapproved. This patronage or *prostasia* of Thessaly over Doris challenges observation.

32. 1. **ἐκ τῆς Δωρίδος ἐς τὴν Φωκίδα**: the exact frontier between Doris and Phokis is not very clearly marked by any actual boundary; the list of townships destroyed, in c. 33 *infra*, seems to show that K. O. Mueller, *l.c. supr.*, extended the *ποδεών* too far in taking it down so as to include Lilaia, though that place, oddly enough, is not included in the list. But Hdt.'s topography of Phokis is not quite all that it might have been (*die Angaben stimmen nicht zur Lokalität*, Stein).

2. **οἱ μέν**: the corresponding term is found in *οἱ δὲ πλεῦνες*, *infra*. The first term may perhaps be referred to the

τῶν Φωκέων ἐς τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ Παρνησοῦ ἀνέβησαν· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐπιτηδέη δέξασθαι ὅμιλον τοῦ Παρνησοῦ ἡ κορυφή, κατὰ Νέωνα πόλιν κειμένη ἐπ᾽ ἑωυτῆς· Τιθορέα οὔνομα αὐτῇ· ἐς τὴν δὴ ἀνηνείκαντο καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνέβησαν. οἱ δὲ πλεῦνες αὐτῶν

---

3 *παρνησοῦ* **a**: *παρνησσοῦ* ‖ *ἀνέβησαν . . Παρνησοῦ* om. R 4 *παρνησοῦ* A: *παρνισοῦ* B: *παρνησσοῦ* 5 *κειμένην ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς*? van H. ‖ *τιθωρέα* **B** ‖ *ἐς τὴν διάνηνείκαντο* R: *ἐς σπάρτην ἀνενείκαντο* Eustath. Od. p. 1604: *ἀνηνείκαντό* <*τε πάντα*> *καὶ*? van H.

---

fighting men, and the second, the majority, to the non-combatants.

3. **τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ Παρνησοῦ** need not necessarily be restricted to just the two famous topmost peaks, Lykorea and Tithorea, which earned Parnassos the title of *biceps*: Ovid, *Metam.* 2. 221; cp. 1. 316 *Mons ibi verticibus petit arduus astra duobus, Nomine Parnassus*; Lucan, *Phars.* 5. 72 *Parnassus gemino petit aethera colle.* The mountain has many *ἄκρα*, like every other large range or system: *ἄκρα* (*τά*) is used by Hdt. for high ground, as in 6. 100 *τὰ ἄκρα τῆς Εὐβοίης*: and the very next sentence seems to show that Hdt. himself thought of Parnassos as having only one *κορυφή*, though it might have many *ἄκρα*. But cp. next note. Pausanias 10. 32. 2 employs the phrase *τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ Παρνασοῦ*.

4. **τοῦ Παρνησοῦ ἡ κορυφή**: Parnassos is a mountain with twin peaks, of which Tithorea was only one; cp. previous note. Hdt. treats Tithorea here as the sole summit. In c. 39 *infra* he names another *κορυφή* Hyampeia, but that is in a story from another (a Delphian) source; and moreover the word *κορυφή* there may be used simply for a peak, cp. c. 37—not as here obviously for the absolute summit. This sentence, however, comes in curiously, and has somewhat the air of an insertion, from the author's own hand, for (i.) it postpones the correlative to *οἵ μέν* above, and (ii.) it contains a slight correction of the foregoing statement, as it shows the Phokian minority gone up not to *τὰ ἄκρα* generally but to *ἡ κορυφή*, that is to Tithorea. Ulrichs (*l.c. infra*) suggests that the inhabitants of Neon retired to a large cave, well supplied with water, and impregnable, which lies behind *Velitza.*

κατὰ Νέωνα . . Τιθορέα: Bursian, *Geogr. von Griechenl.* i. (1862) 166, proves that there was in later times a township named *Τιθόρρα* (inscripp.) or *Τιθόρα* (inscripp. and Plutarch, *Sulla* 15), or (in the MSS. generally) *Τιθορέα*, or (in Steph. B. erroneously) *Τιθοραία*, and asserts that Tithora occupied the site of the older city Neon. Extensive remains near the modern village of *Velitza* attest the site of Tithora, beyond doubt. Cp. Ulrichs, 'Topographie und Inschriften von Tithora,' *Rhein. M.* N.F. 2. 544 ff. (1843), but Ulrichs denies the absolute identity of the sites of the old Neon and the new Tithora, and identifies Neon with a site at *Palea-Fiva* some five miles north of *Velitza* (Tithora). The name of Neon, but not that of Tithora, occurs in the list of the twenty-two members of the Phokian League given by Pausanias 10. 3. 2. His remarks on the present passage may be quoted in full: 10. 32. 5 *διάφορα ἐς τὸ ὄνομα οἶδα τῆς πόλεως Ἡροδότῳ τε εἰρημένα ἐν ἐπιστρατείᾳ τοῦ Μήδου καὶ Βακίδι ἐν χρησμοῖς. Βάκις μέν γε Τιθορέας τοὺς ἐνθάδε ἐκάλεσεν ἀνθρώπους· Ἡροδότου δὲ ὁ ἐς αὐτοὺς λόγος ἐπιόντος φησὶ τοῦ βαρβάρου τοὺς ἐνταῦθα οἰκοῦντας ἀναφυγεῖν ἐς τὴν κορυφήν, ὄνομα δὲ Νεῶνα μὲν τῇ πόλει, Τιθορέαν δὲ εἶναι τοῦ Παρνασοῦ τῇ ἄκρᾳ. ἔοικεν οὖν ἀνὰ χρόνον πρῶτα μὲν δὴ τῇ ἁπάσῃ χώρᾳ, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ἐπειδὴ ἀνῳκίσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν κωμῶν, ἐκνικῆσαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πόλει Τιθορέαν μηδὲ ἔτι Νεῶνα ὀνομάζεσθαι. Τιθορέᾳ δὲ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι τεθῆναί φασιν ἀπὸ Τιθορέας νύμφης, οἷαι τὸ ἀρχαῖον λόγῳ τῷ ποιητῶν ἐφύοντο ἀπό τε ἄλλων δένδρων καὶ μάλιστα ἀπὸ τῶν δρυῶν.* (But what has Tithorea to do with trees?) Grasberger, *Gr. Ortsnamen*, attempts to connect *Τιθοραία* (*sic*), 'name of one of the heights of Parnassos,' with *τιτθός* a 'pap.' The name *Τιθόρα* has a more archaic appearance than *Νεών* (*sic ap.* Pausan.), and its later use was perhaps a revival, although applied to a fresh site.

6. **ἀνηνείκαντο**: sc. *τὰ ἑαυτῶν*: cp. c. 36 *infra*; 3. 148 *ἀνενεικάμενος τὰ ἔχων ἐξεχώρησε* makes the meaning clear.

ἐς τοὺς Ὀζόλας Λοκροὺς ἐξεκομίσαντο, ἐς Ἄμφισσαν πόλιν τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κρισαίου πεδίου οἰκημένην. οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι τὴν χώρην πᾶσαν ἐπέδραμον τὴν Φωκίδα· Θεσσαλοὶ γὰρ οὕτω ἦγον τὸν στρατόν· ὁκόσα δὲ ἐπέσχον, πάντα ἐπέφλεγον καὶ ἔκειρον, καὶ ἐς τὰς πόλις ἐνιέντες πῦρ καὶ ἐς τὰ ἱρά.

33 *πορευόμενοι γὰρ ταύτῃ παρὰ τὸν Κηφισὸν ποταμὸν ἐδηίουν πάντα, καὶ κατὰ μὲν ἔκαυσαν Δρυμὸν πόλιν κατὰ δὲ Χαράδραν*

---

7 *ἄμφισαν* C 8 *κρισσαίου* **B** || *οἰκημένην* Stein², van H.: *κειμένην* C: *οἰκεομένην* ceteri, Stein¹, Holder 11 *πόλιας* **B**: *πόλεις* C || *καὶ ἐς τὰ ἱρά*: *καὶ ἴστα ἱρά* B: *καὶ ἔστερα* V: *καὶ ἔτερα* R: *κατέκαιον* S 33. 1 *ταύτῃ*: *τά τε*? Stein² || *παρὰ* om. C || *κηφισσὸν* **B**Pz || *ἐδήουν* **B**: *ἐδῄουν* z 2 *Δρύμον* Stein¹ || *χαράνδραν* C: *χαράδρην* PRSz (*χαρά* cum *δρ* supersc. V)

---

7. **Ὀζόλας Λοκρούς**: Hdt. distinguishes from the *Ὀπούντιοι Λοκροί*: cp. 7. 203, c. 1 *supra*. They are the Western Lokrians in the peninsula, a primitive, not to say barbarous, folk even in the days of Thucydides (1. 5. 3), but useful allies withal on occasion (3. 95. 3). The 'Epizephyrian' Lokri are also mentioned by Hdt. 6. 23. Pausanias 10. 38 gives five different explanations of the name *Ozolai*, and Strabo 427 adds a sixth. Five of these connect the name with one bad smell or another (*ὄζειν*); one traces it to *ὄζος*, a branch, shoot, but with a fanciful legend attached. The latter appears the better derivation, in the sense that these were the Branch-Lokri, from the parent stem in Opûs: but need either alternative be more than a *Volksetymologie*?

Ἄμφισσαν: cp. c. 36 *infra*. No doubt the chief city of the Ozolian Lokri, situate at the inner edge of the 'Krisaian plain,' on the main route from Delphi to Thermopylai. The Amphissaians were not always on good terms with the Phokians; cp. Thuc. 3. 101. 2. Amphissa was denounced for sacrilege by Aischines in 340 B.C., and destroyed by Philip two years later (cp. J. B. Bury, *Hist. of Greece*, ii. 314 ff.), but subsequently restored, as its coinage attests (cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* 286).

8. **τοῦ Κρισαίου πεδίου**: neither Krisa, nor its port Kirrha, were in existence when Hdt. wrote; but neither here, nor elsewhere, has he taken occasion to refer to the so-called *ἱερὸς πόλεμος* which led to their destruction; cp. note to c. 29 *supra*. The old name must have clung to the fertile landscape, as it certainly clung to the bay, round which the landscape lies; cp. Thuc. 1. 107. 3, 2. 69. 1, etc.

10. **οὕτω**: sc. *ὥστε τὴν χώρην πᾶσαν ἐπιδραμεῖν*.

ὁκόσα δὲ ἐπέσχον: cp. c. 35 *infra* *ὅσα δὲ καὶ οὗτοι ἐπέσχον τῆς Φωκίδος, πάντα ἐσιναμώρεον*. Whatever places they touched, reached, overspread, they devastated. Cp. 1. 104 *οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι τὴν Ἀσίην πᾶσαν ἔπεσχον*. It is an abstract synonym for the more graphic and concrete *ἐπέδραμον*.

33. 1. **τὸν Κηφισὸν ποταμόν**: cp. 7. 178. The river Kephisos had its source proper in the territory of Lilaia: Pausan. 10. 33. 4 *Λίλαιαν δὲ τῶν καλουμένων Ναΐδων καὶ Θυγατέρα εἶναι τοῦ Κηφισοῦ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς νύμφης τὸ ὄνομα τεθῆναι τῇ πόλει φασί*. It was a day's journey across Parnassos from Lilaia to Delphi, *ib.*, i.e. there was a regular path that way. Lilaia (mod. *Agoriani*?) was a regular member of the Phokian League (Pausan. 10. 3. 2), and no doubt shared the fate of the other Phokian cities on this occasion. Pausanias 10. 33. 7 says: *γῆ δὲ διακεκριμένως ἀρίστη τῆς Φωκίδος ἐστὶν ἡ παρὰ τὸν Κηφισὸν καὶ φυτεῦσαι καὶ σπείρειν καὶ ἀνεῖναι νομάς· καὶ γεωργεῖται ταῦτα μάλιστα τῆς χώρας ὥστε κτλ.*

2. **κατὰ μὲν . . κατὰ δέ**: a remarkable tmesis; cp. 5. 81.

Δρυμὸν πόλιν: no doubt the *Δρυμαία* of Pausanias' list *l.c.*, *Δρυμία ap.* Steph. B., twenty stades distant from Tithronion, on the high ground above left bank of the river.

Χαράδραν: twenty stades east of Lilaia, that is, on the right (south) side of the river. The town suffered from

καὶ Ἔρωχον καὶ Τεθρώνιον καὶ Ἀμφίκαιαν καὶ Νέωνα καὶ Πεδιέας καὶ Τριτέας καὶ Ἐλάτειαν καὶ Ὑάμπολιν καὶ Παρα-

3 *τεθρόνιον* **B** : *Θρόνιον* Eustath. Il. p. 638 || *ἀμφίκαια* R

want of water, Pausan. 10. 33. 6. Charadra and Dryonaia may be taken to represent the frontier townships. Frazer, *Paus.* v. 416, gives a plan of the ruins, and puts the name on his map of Phokis (vol. vi.).

3. **Ἔρωχον**: Erochos occurs in Pausanias' list between Daulis and Charadra; Leake, *N.G.* ii. 89, regarded its site as undiscoverable; Bursian, *op. c.* i. 162, places it conjecturally between Charadra and Tithronion; it appears on Grundy's and Kiepert's maps on the left side of the river, between Tithronion and Elateia. It was probably a small place, apparently restored after the Phokian war (in which it had been destroyed again); cp. Frazer, *Paus.* v. 215 (10. 3. 2).

Τεθρώνιον lay on a plain, 15 stades from Amphikleia, and 20 from Drymaia (Pausan. 10. 33. 12), apparently on the left side of the river: *παρέχεται δὲ οὐδὲν ἐς μνήμην*, *ibid.* (Tithrone, Plin.; *Τιθρώνιον* Steph. B.)

Ἀμφίκαιαν, Pausanias states that the correct form of the name was *Ἀμφίκλεια*, and appeared in the *Dogma* of the Amphiktyons on the destruction of the Phokian cities; but *Ἡρόδοτος μὲν Ἀμφίκαιαν ἐκάλεσεν ἑπόμενος τῷ ἀρχαιοτάτῳ τῶν λόγων*. Amphikaia was certainly the epichorian form, as is proved by the local legend narrated by Pausanias. This form was associated with a cult of Dionysos, and cures were effected *δι' ὀνειράτων*. The site is identified, apparently, on the hills to the south of Kephisos, below and east of Lilaia, just above the modern *Dadi* (Frazer v. 420): Pausanias' measurements here appear untrustworthy: Bursian i. 162.

Νέωνα: on the skirts of Parnassos; cp. c. 32 *supra*.

4. **Πεδιέας καὶ Τριτέας**: these names do not occur in Pausanias' list, nor elsewhere except in this place. Bursian (i. 163) condemns Leake's conjecture that *Πεδιεῖς* represents the township *Λέδων* (not mentioned by Hdt.), and suggests that these two towns never recovered after their destruction by the Persians in 480 B.C., although a *Τριταία* in Ozolian Lokris may, he supposes with almost equally little reason, be a new home for the Phokian *Τριτεεῖς*.

Ἐλάτειαν: the chief city of Phokis *μετά γε τοὺς Δελφούς*, Pausan. 10. 34. Its site is identified (Leake ii. 82, Bursian i. 163, Frazer v. 425 ff.), commanding the outlet of the pass of Hyampolis (c. 28 *supra*). Its strategic importance becomes more prominent in the fourth century, and the Makedonian period. The immortal passage, in which Demosthenes describes the seizure of Elateia by Philip in 338 B.C. (*de Cor.* 284), is, or was, known to every schoolboy.

Ὑάμπολιν: on the main road from Boiotia and Phokis to Opûs, and so to Thermopylai; cp. c. 28 *supra*. Pausanias 10. 35. 5 records that the city was a settlement of *Ὕαντες* from Thebes, and that the full name of the city was *Ὑάντων πόλις*. Kleonai, the actual scene of the Thessalian defeat (cp. Plutarch, *l.c.* c. 28 *supra*) a little higher up the pass, was presumably a dependency of Hyampolis; remains of Hyampolis are identifiable (Leake ii. 167, Bursian i. 165, Frazer v. 442). The city would be the first exposed to the attack of a force coming from Thermopylai, and probably in 480 B.C. (with Abai) was destroyed, not by the Persian column which had crossed from Malis into Doris, and then worked down the Kephisos valley, spreading ruin and death wherever it came, but by the main column, which must have advanced from Thermopylai along the coast, and through the pass of Hyampolis.

Παραποταμίους. Parapotamioi appears in Pausanias' list of the Phokian League, but the city had never recovered from its destruction by the Amphiktyons in the Phokian war. *Παραποταμίων μὲν δὴ οὔτε ἐρείπια ἔτι ἦν, οὔτε ἔνθα τῆς χώρας ᾠκίσθη ἡ πόλις μνημονεύουσιν* (10. 33. 8). The more careful modern *periegetai* have improved upon this. The site has been identified in the narrow strait, between Mounts Philoboiotos and Hadyleion, through which the Kephisos passes from the plain of Elateia to the plain of Chaironeia (Leake ii. 97, Bursian i. 164, Frazer v. 418). The order in which Hdt. names Hyampolis, Parapotamioi and Abai is not geographical in either direction. Abai is probably placed last, because there is a note to add to the name.

ποταμίους καὶ Ἄβας, ἔνθα ἦν ἱρὸν Ἀπόλλωνος πλούσιον, θησαυροῖσί τε καὶ ἀναθήμασι πολλοῖσι κατεσκευασμένον· ἦν δὲ καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν ἔτι χρηστήριον αὐτόθι. καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν, καὶ τινὰς διώκοντες εἷλον τῶν Φωκέων πρὸς τοῖσι ὄρεσι, καὶ γυναῖκας τινὰς διέφθειραν μισγόμενοι ὑπὸ πλήθεος.

34 Παραποταμίους δὲ παραμειβόμενοι οἱ βάρβαροι ἀπίκοντο ἐς Πανοπέας. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἤδη διακρινομένη ἡ στρατιὴ αὐτῶν

7 ἔτι: ἔστι **B**, Holder: 'an ἔτι ἔστι?' van H. 8 συλλήσαντες **B**z || τῶν om. **a** 9 οὔρεσι CPz, van H. || διέφθειρον **B** 34. 1 παραμειψάμενοι van H.

Hyampolis and Parapotamioi are then in the order in which they would have been visited by a force coming from Opûs. Cp. also next chapter.

5. **Ἄβας**: Abai was plainly situate lower down the (Assos) valley than Hyampolis, Pausan. 10. 35. 1. Its site is clearly identified (Leake ii. 164, Bursian i. 165, Frazer v. 436 with plans). Hyampolis, the city of the Hyantes, was also known as Hya; and it is possible that Abai was the city of the Abantes: Abantopolis! But the statement of Aristotle *ap.* Strabon. 445 that the old name of Euboia, viz. Abantis, was traceable to Thrakians, who crossed over into the island from Abai, in Phokis, is not convincing. The chief claim of Abai to renown was no doubt its Apolline oracle.

6. **θησαυροῖσί τε καὶ ἀναθήμασι**: some of them due to the pious liberality of Kroisos, 1. 46. It is a little remarkable that Hdt. does not specify this point here, especially in view of the notice in c. 35 *infra*; but perhaps when he wrote this passage originally he was not yet acquainted with the story of the Trial of the Oracles; in other words, his silence here makes for the earlier composition of Books 7–9; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

ἦν δὲ καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν ἔτι: sc. ἔστι. The χρηστήριον survived the destruction of the ἱρόν, and was even consulted in the following winter on behalf of Mardonios, c. 134 *infra*, a point which might tempt one to postpone the destruction of Abai till after the Plataian campaign.

7. **τὸ ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν**: Pausanias, 10. 35. 2, says that this was one of the temples left in ruins as a witness of the war with the barbarians. The ruined temple was again fired by the Thebans in the Phokian war; but of the twenty-two members of the Phokian League Abai was the only city not destroyed and 'di-oikized' by the Amphiktyons, being, indeed, the only one not associated in the sacrilegious attack on Delphi.

9. **γυναῖκας τινὰς διέφθειραν**: from the specification it might be inferred that such atrocities were unknown in Hellenic warfare.

10. **ὑπὸ πλήθεος**, *prae multitudine*, sc. τῶν μισγομένων (Stein).

34. 1. **Παραποταμίους δέ**: this reversion to Parapotamioi, which just above was mentioned between Hyampolis and Abai, replaces it in its proper geographical position, at the lower extremity of the Elateian plain.

2. **ἐς Πανοπέας**: Panopeus, but twenty stades from Chaironeia, commanding the open frontier passage, according to Pausanias 10. 4. 1, appears in the list of the Phokian League, though the *periegete* is inclined to challenge its title to be a city at all, so poorly was it provided with all that doth a city make: ἀρχεῖα, γυμνάσιον, θέατρον, ἀγορά, κρήνη. Still the citizens had *termini* (ὅροι) and they sent representatives to the Phokian *sanhedrim*. He is curiously blind, apparently, to the evidences of its former greatness and strategic importance; cp. Leake ii. 110, Bursian i. 168, Frazer v. 216 ff. Πανοπεύς appears in the Homeric Catalogue *Il.* 2. 520 side by side with Daulis; cp. 17. 307; and in *Od.* 11. 581 as on the road to Delphi; cp. Pausan. *l.c.* In Thucydides the name is modified into the form Φανοτεύς, 4. 89. 2; cp. 4. 76. 3 ἔστι δὲ ἡ Χαιρώνεια ἔσχατον τῆς Βοιωτίας πρὸς τῇ Φανοτίδι τῆς

ἐσχίζετο· τὸ μὲν πλεῖστον καὶ δυνατώτατον τοῦ στρατοῦ ἅμα αὐτῷ Ξέρξῃ πορευόμενον ἐπ' Ἀθήνας ἐσέβαλε ἐς Βοιωτούς, ἐς γῆν τὴν Ὀρχομενίων. Βοιωτῶν δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος ἐμήδιζε,

4 ἐπ': ἐς **B** ‖ ἐς Βοιωτοὺς καὶ Βοιωτῶν ἐς suspicatur Kallenberg 5 γῆν τῶν **B**: τὴν τῶν z

Φωκίδος. So Strabo (following Homer) 423 after Daulis mentions *Πανοπεὺς δ' ὁ νῦν Φανοτεύς, ὅμορος τοῖς περὶ Λεβάδειαν τόποις* (of which the insignificant Chaironeia might be one). The Herodotean form of the name is *Πανοπέες* (*-εῖς*).

διακρινομένη ἡ στρατιὴ αὐτῶν ἐσχίζετο. Hdt. thinks that at Panopeus there was a new departure. Hitherto the army has advanced, according to him, in a single column, from Thermopylai, *via* Doris, and the upper valley of the Kephisos, through the pass at Parapotamioi, to Panopeus. At this point, however, a division of the forces takes effect. One column, the smaller one, is detached for service against Delphi; the other, and larger portion of the army, advances with Xerxes into Boiotia, and so to Attika. It has been already shown that from Thermopylai the Persians must have advanced in at least two, and possibly even in three, columns; cp. cc. 28, 31 *supra*. Two of these columns would naturally have reunited at Parapotamioi, or at Panopeus, unless indeed the left column in the advance crossed the mountain direct by the road from Hyampolis and Abai to Orchomenos (*ἡ ἐπὶ Ὀποῦντα λεωφόρος ἡ ἐξ Ὀρχομενοῦ* of Pausanias 10. 35. 1). As the main baggage-train and cavalry probably came by the coast route from Thermopylai, this alternative seems the less probable. Parapotamioi, then, may be looked upon as the probable *rendezvous* of the two columns from Thermopylai, that which devastated upper Phokis, and that which visited Hyampolis and Abai (and possibly other places on Mount Knemis). The columns thus reunited may have passed from Parapotamioi to Panopeus. From Panopeus too a column may have been detached to visit Delphi, as here narrated; but the story of the visit to Delphi is in itself open to the gravest suspicion (see further below), and it is even possible that, if the Persians ever visited Delphi at all, Panopeus was not the point of departure, but the point of reunion, for the forces. The start for Delphi might have been made from Trachis, or from Doris, and the route followed might have been by Amphissa to Delphi, and from Delphi down to Panopeus. The specification of Amphissa, c. 32 *supra*, as the chief refuge for the Phokians, is against this hypothesis, though the excellence of the route is in its favour. Or, again, the Persian column, operating in the upper Kephisos valley, might have detached a force at Lilaia—so curiously omitted by Hdt.—to go straight across Parnassos to Delphi. *Λίλαια δὲ ἡμέρας μὲν ὁδὸν καὶ ὥρᾳ χειμῶνος ἀπέχει Δελφῶν κατιοῦσι διὰ τοῦ Παρνασοῦ* Pausan. 10. 33. 3. The Persian force would then have rejoined the main body at Daulis, or Panopeus. One admission the Herodotean story makes: it shows a vague consciousness that through Central Greece the Persian forces had not moved all along in one single mass, on one single route.

4. **ἐς Βοιωτούς, ἐς γῆν τὴν Ὀρχομενίων**: the designation of the whole, followed by the designation of the part (cp. c. 23 *supra*). From Panopeus one road led west to Daulis (cp. next c.) and so to (or from) Delphi; another east to Chaironeia, little more than a couple of miles (twenty stades) distant. The actual frontier between Phokis and Boiotia must be sought in this interval; Bursian (*op. cit.* i. 167) finds it in the bed of the *Μόλος* or *Μώριος*, a small torrent descending from the north-western portion of Helikon and emptying into the Kephisos at the foot of Mount Hadyleion (Plutarch, *Sulla*, 17, 19). Hdt. does not mention Chaironeia, which was not at this time politically an important place, nor even an independent member of the Boiotian Confederacy (cp. Thuc. 4. 76. 3), but stood, probably, to Orchomenos in much the same relation as that between Kleonai and Hyampolis in Phokis (cp. c. 33 *supra*). Orchomenos was still no doubt the chief city in the western (or north-western) plain of Boiotia, though fallen from its high estate in 'Minyan' times, and now inferior in political importance to Thebes; cp. further 9. 16, notes.

5. **Βοιωτῶν δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος ἐμήδιζε:**

τὰς δὲ πόλις αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Μακεδόνες διατεταγμένοι ἔσῳζον ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀποπεμφθέντες· ἔσῳζον δὲ τῇδε, δῆλον βουλόμενοι ποιέειν Ξέρξῃ ὅτι τὰ Μήδων Βοιωτοὶ φρονέοιεν.

6 πόλιας **B** || ἔσῳζον (bis) van H., Stein[3]: ἔσωζον 7 τῇδε om. **B**, 'et commode abesse potest' van H. || βουλόμενοι δῆλον *z*

the political significance of this statement is ambiguous; is πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος, *plebs universa*, in distinction to the aristocracy? Or is it merely *universa multitudo*, the vast majority, independent of social rank, or political privilege? Again, what is the force and value of the contrast between τὸ πλῆθος and τὰς πόλις? Is the πλῆθος wholly outside the πόλεις? Is it merely the *plebs* or *multitudo rustica*? Or is there any emphasis on the distinction? Or are the πόλεις specifically the citadels?

Baehr understands πλῆθος here as *plebs*, and takes the point to be that the rustic population, which was 'plebeian,' joined the Persians, while the cities, inhabited or held by the upper classes, were anti-Persian, but were saved from Persian vengeance by the good offices of the Makedonians. But this use of τὸ πλῆθος is hardly Herodotean (even 3. 80, 81 πλῆθος ἄρχον, ἐς τὸ πλῆθος φέρειν τὸ κράτος not quite justifying the supposed political and social connotation of the word, as used in this passage). And again, that interpretation would not square with the points in the Plataio-Theban argument in Thuc. 3. 53–67 (*ex hypothesi* 427 B.C.), where the Plataians represent themselves, and that to the oligarchic Spartans, as the only Boiotians who had not medized; while the Theban reply is not that only the democratic multitude medized, but that the medism of Thebes was due to the inner ring of oligarchy (δυναστεία ὀλίγων ἀνδρῶν 3. 62. 3).

Βοιωτῶν πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος here is, therefore, to be understood 'the Boiotians without (or with hardly) an exception.' But Thespiai and Plataia were, of course, exceptions: perhaps, however, they were not truly 'Boiotians.'

6. **τὰς δὲ πόλις αὐτῶν . . ἔσῳζον**: Makedonian garrisons were introduced into the various Boiotian cities, and preserved them from the Persians, and the fate of the Phokian townships. Hdt. does not enumerate or specify the Boiotian cities thus preserved, but he records, c. 50 *infra*, the destruction of Thespiai and of Plataiai, and other Boiotian cities he names incidentally: Orchomenos (as here), Lebadeia c. 134 *infra*, Thebes c. 134 *infra*, *et passim*, Tanagra 9. 15 *et al.*, Akraiphia c. 135 *infra*, and perhaps inferentially Kopai *ibid.* Phokis was made more memorable by its misfortunes than Boiotia by its immunities.

διατεταγμένοι: distributed, by order, throughout the cities severally. 'The men of Makedon' were apparently not single agents, but bodies of soldiers, garrisons.

7. **ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀποπεμφθέντες**: the absence of the patronymic is to be observed. Alexander is treated as a known quantity; the article is equally absent, for he has not been named recently; but this passage could not be his first introduction: cp. 7. 173, 175. These Makedonian garrisons appear to have been sent on ahead.

τῇδε, 'for this purpose.' Hdt. ascribes to the men (βουλόμενοι) what must have been the wish and policy of their master. This good understanding between Alexander and the Boiotians, i.e. primarily the Thebans, throws considerable doubt upon the loyalty of Thebes and Boiotia to the national cause in the first instance. But the precautions taken to save them from pillage, if necessary, would show, either that the Persian forces were getting out of hand, or that the Boiotians had really made a stand at Thermopylai, and provoked the enemy.

It is, however, quite possible that here, as elsewhere, while the *act* is historical, the *motive* is fictitious. Makedonian garrisons may have been introduced into the Boiotian cities, not for the purpose of saving them from the Persians, but for the purpose of saving the medizing factions from the loyal or 'hellenizing' party. The curious turn of phrase, ὅτι τὰ Μήδων Βοιωτοὶ φρονέοιεν, 'that there were Boiotians of the Medes' way of thinking,' may support that view. With φρονέειν cp. 7. 145; with τὰ Μ. cp. τὰ Ἑλλήνων c. 30 *supra*.

οὗτοι μὲν δὴ τῶν βαρβάρων ταύτῃ ἐτράποντο, ἄλλοι δὲ αὐτῶν **35**
ἡγεμόνας ἔχοντες ὁρμέατο ἐπὶ τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι, ἐν δεξιῇ τὸν Παρνησὸν ἀπέργοντες. ὅσα δὲ καὶ οὗτοι ἐπέσχον τῆς Φωκίδος, πάντα ἐσιναμώρεον· καὶ γὰρ τῶν Πανοπέων τὴν πόλιν ἐνέπρησαν καὶ Δαυλίων καὶ Αἰολιδέων. ἐπορεύοντο

---

35. 2 *ὡρμέατο* CP 3 *παρνησὸν* **α** : *παρνησσὸν* Pz : 5 *αἰολίδων* Pz : *Λιλαιέων* Valckenaer, (Blakesley), van H.

---

35. 1. **ταύτῃ** : sc. *ἐς Βοιωτούς*.

ἄλλοι δὲ αὐτῶν : Hdt. gives neither the number of the force sent to Delphi, nor the name of its commander.

ἡγεμόνας : sc. *τῆς ὁδοῦ*, cp. c. 31 *supra* : their names, their race, anonymous too !

2. **ὁρμέατο** has no psychological suggestion, but is purely mechanical; cp. 7. 215 *ὁρμέατο δὲ περὶ λύχνων ἁφὰς ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου*.

τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι : the geographical position of Delphi hardly requires elucidation, in general: situate on a sloping edge, or shelf of rock, 2000 feet above the sea, backed by sheer cliffs of Parnassos, with the gorge of the Pleistos immediately below walled in by the ridge of Kirphis, with the fertile plain of Amphissa, of Kirrha, beyond, in full view of the Krissaian bay, and sighting the Arkadian mountains that tower beyond the Korinthian gulf, Delphi yields in natural charms and grandeur of aspect and prospect to no landscape in Hellas ! It is accessible from three directions : (i.) The easiest route comes up from the sea, across the plain, and the steep spurs of Parnassos, half a day's journey. (ii.) Behind Delphi, up over the western heights and glades of Parnassos, runs the path to Lilaia (*Agoriani*) in the valley of the Kephisos, cp. c. 33 *supra*. (iii.) Away to the east goes the better route, first rising and then descending, from Delphi to Boiotia, forking after a while (the *σχιστὴ ὁδός* !), the right path running on to Lebadeia, the left to Daulia, Panopeus, and so on into Boiotia, cp. 1. 4 *supra*. It is by this last route that Hdt. would have us conceive the Persian column approaching the shrine. *τὸ ἱρόν* was of course the fabric of the Alkmaionidai : 5. 62. On all that concerns the topography and archæology of the place cf. Frazer's *Pausanias*, v. 234–398 (pending the full and official publication of the results of the excavations conducted by the French School).

ἐν δεξιῇ τὸν Παρνησὸν ἀπέργοντες : these words would describe their position ever since they crossed from Trachis into Doris, and then marched down the Kephisos. They would also bar out, if accepted as final, not merely the advance on Delphi by the *Πυθιάς* or sacred road from the north, *via* Amphissa, but also an advance from Lilaia across Parnassos, by which the highest points of Parnassos would still have lain to the left. Hdt., believing Panopeus to be the point of departure, naturally says they marched with Parnassos on their right, and, he might have added, with Helikon and Kirphis on their left.

3. **ὅσα δὲ . . ἐπέσχον . . ἐσιναμώρεον** : cp. c. 32 *supra*. *σιναμωρέειν* (cp. 1. 152, 5. 92 *σινάμωρος*) appears to be a strengthened variant of *σίνεσθαι* or *σινέεσθαι*, c. 31 *supra*. The conduct ascribed to them is irrational, as they would need supplies on their way back from Delphi—for they must have intended to return ; and this statement is, therefore, inconsistent with the idea that the visitors for Delphi started on this occasion from Panopeus.

4. **Πανοπέων** : cp. 34 *supra* ; i.e. after the main army had gone on into Boiotia this corps remained behind and destroyed Panopeus ! If the corps detached for Delphi destroyed Panopeus, then assuredly it was on the way down from Delphi, and not before starting. This inference favours the view that this corps had marched *via* Lilaia or Amphissa.

5. **Δαυλίων**, situate a little way up the ascent of route (iii.), and the last station apparently on the road to Delphi (cp. Strabo 423). From Daulis to Delphi (or *vice versa*) is an easy day's march ; cp. *Iliad* 2. 520, Thuc. 2. 29. 3.

Αἰολιδέων, unknown and unintelligible as a place-name : does it represent the modern *Arachova* ? i.e. Anemoreia (cp. Bursian, *op. cit.* i. 170, Frazer v. 232). Or shall we not rather accept Valckenaer's conjecture ΛΙΛΑΙΕΩΝ, approved by Blakesley,

δὲ ταύτῃ ἀποσχισθέντες τῆς ἄλλης στρατιῆς τῶνδε εἵνεκα, ὅκως συλήσαντες τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι βασιλέι Ξέρξῃ ἀποδέξαιεν τὰ χρήματα. πάντα δ' ἠπίστατο τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ ὅσα λόγου ἦν ἄξια Ξέρξης, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, ἄμεινον ἢ τὰ

---

6 *ταύτην* **a** || *εἵνεκεν* **B** 7 *συλλήσαντες* Sz || *τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι* 'moleste repetitum' Kallenberg || *Ξέρξῃ* del. van H. 8 *δὲ ἐπιστέατο* RSV (*ἐπίστατο* Schaefer, Bekker) || *τὰ* om. **B**

---

and then reverse the route of this corps, and obtain a name which is conspicuous by its absence in the Herodotean catalogue? *Λιλαιέων* would of course be from *Λιλαιεύς* or *Λίλαιαι*. Lilaia was an important member of the Phokian confederacy, and its omission from Hdt.'s list (which with it contains fifteen of the twenty-one names in the list of Pausanias) is very remarkable. Cp. note to c. 33 *supra*.

6. **τῶνδε εἵνεκα.** The political position and relations of the oracle at the time are of vital importance as bearing upon the story of the Persian visitation in 480 B.C. In the *Iliad* Pytho, or Python, is apparently as much a Phokian city as Daulis or Panopeus, Hyampolis or Lilaia (2. 517 ff.), which proves, *inter alia*, that the *Catalogue* is older than the First Sacred War. That war, waged by the 'Amphiktyons' on behalf of the Delphians, raised or secured the pan-Hellenic significance of the oracle, and doubtless emancipated it completely from Phokian leading. Whether an Ionian (Athens-Sikyon) or a Dorian (Sparta) or a Thessalian influence thereafter predominated may be matter of dispute; but the Phokians at least were but one among the Amphiktyonic folks. The war with the Thessalians, *οὐ πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον ταύτης τῆς βασιλέος στρατηλασίης* c. 27 *supra*, may have had something of the character of a *ἱερὸς πολεμός*, although never so described. It cannot, however, be supposed that on the eve of the Persian war the Delphic oracle had sunk again to be a mere member of the Phokian League, or a mere organ of Phokian policy; the continuous notices of the oracle's action and utterances, from the date of the destruction of the temple in 548 B.C. to the Persian war, forbid that hypothesis. Or even if Phokian influence had been predominant, at least as against Thessalian, would the Thessalians have aimed at the destruction of the Amphiktyonic shrine, and not rather at the re-establishment of their own influence in Delphi, as commissaries and protégés of the Persian? The national Phokian oracle was at Abai; hence its treatment, c. 33 *supra*. Delphi was the concern of twelve peoples, of whom nine were now on the king's part, the Thessalians *imprimis*. Clearly the Thessalians cannot have taken the Persians to Delphi *ὅκως συλήσαντες τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι β. Ξ. ἀποδέξαιεν τὰ χρήματα.*

8. **ἀποδέξαιεν τὰ χρήματα**, 'might exhibit, display, the objects of value' (not merely money). The assumption appears to be that they would pillage the temple, bring away the things, and exhibit them to the king—when they had overtaken him. Some of the things would have been rather difficult to transport, especially by that route! And would the king have been content merely to be a spectator of the show? If so, his best way was to go to Delphi in person and see for himself. The phrase might suggest that course as the one actually taken; but as in the sequel the Persians were utterly discomfited and routed, and no such disaster was or could be reported of the king himself, did the Delphic apologist discreetly suppress the visit of the Persian king?

πάντα δ' ἠπίστατο . . ἔλιπε: this assertion would read less like a gross exaggeration if Xerxes had, indeed, visited Delphi, and seen the temple and its treasures with his own eyes. Otherwise the statement is a frigid absurdity, not made any better by the rationalistic reminder **πολλῶν αἰεὶ λεγόντων**, nor by the cautious asseveration **ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι.** Where could Hdt. have convinced himself by inquiry of this absurdity if not in Delphi itself? The Delphian visitation is obviously from a Delphian source, and the story of it, a patent apology for the attitude of Delphi in the war, is an obvious insertion in the main draft of the history. Cp. Introduction, §§ 9, 10, Appendix III. § 7.

ἐν τοῖσι οἰκίοισι ἔλιπε, πολλῶν αἰεὶ λεγόντων, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ Κροίσου τοῦ Ἀλυάττεω ἀναθήματα. οἱ Δελφοὶ δὲ πυν- **36**
θανόμενοι ταῦτα ἐς πᾶσαν ἀρρωδίην ἀπίκατο, ἐν δείματι δὲ μεγάλῳ κατεστεῶτες ἐμαντεύοντο περὶ τῶν ἱρῶν χρημάτων, εἴτε σφέα κατὰ γῆς κατορύξωσι εἴτε ἐκκομίσωσι ἐς ἄλλην χώρην. ὁ δὲ θεός σφεας οὐκ ἔα κινέειν, φὰς αὐτὸς ἱκανὸς εἶναι τῶν ἑωυτοῦ προκατῆσθαι. Δελφοὶ δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες σφέων αὐτῶν πέρι ἐφρόντιζον. τέκνα μέν νυν καὶ γυναῖκας πέρην ἐς τὴν Ἀχαιίην διέπεμψαν, αὐτῶν δὲ οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι

---

11 *ἀλυάττεω* PR **36.** 1 *οἱ δὲ δελφοὶ* **ß**, Holder, van H. 2 *ἀρρωιδίην* P || *ἀπικέατο* Pz || *δὲ* : *τε* **ß** 4 *σφεας* **ß** || *κατορύξουσι* Pz || *εἴτ᾽* **ß** || *ἐκκομίσουσι* Pz 5 *σφεας* abesse malim || *κινεῖν* **α**, Holder, van H. 7 *περιεφρόντιζον* BC 8 *ἀχαΐην* R

---

11. **τὰ Κροίσου τοῦ Ἀλυάττεω ἀναθήματα**: there is no reference here to *ὁ πρῶτος τῶν λόγων*, cp. 5. 36, and the use of the patronymic is noticeable. The observation supports the hypothesis that these Books (7, 8, 9), even in their second or enlarged draft (cp. previous note), were composed and in existence before the earlier Books (and the *Lydian Logoi* of Bk. 1 perhaps before the story of the Ionian Revolt in Bks. 5–6). Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

36. 1. **οἱ Δελφοί**: properly the name of the men, the population; not the place, the city. The place-name is *Πυθώ*, cp. 1. 54 *πέμψας αὖτις ἐς Πυθὼ Δελφοὺς δωρέεται*. The Catalogue, *Iliad* 2. 519, has the form *Πυθών*, but *Πυθώ* (*Πυθοῖ*) in 9. 405 (with the *epitheton constans πετρηέσσῃ*). Pytho would be the holy place and oracular seat itself (hence *ἡ Πυθία*); the name of the people becomes the designation of the secular city. The native form of the name was *Δάλφοι*, a point illustrated, though not specified, in Head's *Hist. Num.* p. 288. Whether the name had anything to say to *δελφίς*, or to *δελφύς* (was not Pytho the *ὀμφαλὸς τῆς γῆς*?) is a question for the etymologists.

2. **ταῦτα** is vague, but may be referred generally to the sentence *ἐπορεύοντο . . χρήματα* rather than to the sentence *πάντα . . ἀναθήματα*, which was an aside by Hdt. *in propria persona*.

ἐς πᾶσαν ἀρρωδίην ἀπίκατο: the pl. perf. is rather intensive than strictly temporal, 'were in the depths of despair'; cp. 4. 140 *ἐς π. ἀρρ. ἀπίκοντο*. **κατεστεῶτες**: the same phrase 7. 138, and cp. c. 12 *supra*.

3. **ἐμαντεύοντο περὶ τῶν ἱρῶν χρημάτων**: the first anxiety of the good Delphians is not about themselves, but about the holy things. **ἐμ.** is strictly medial; they would consult the god through the Pythia, although they apparently suggest two out of three possible alternatives: (*a*) to bury the treasures in the earth somewhere near, (*b*) to convey them into the Peloponnese. Are all the sacred vessels and offerings in all the 'Treasuries' (Lakedaimonian, Sikyonian, Siphnian, Korinthian, Athenian, Knidian, etc.) here in view?

5. **αὐτὸς ἱκανὸς εἶναι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προκατῆσθαι**: the construction is strictly idiomatic. With *προκατῆσθαι* cp. *προκατημένους* 7. 172, in a more strictly physical sense, and the same infinitive 9. 106. The sentiment is a pious rendering, or anticipation, of the legal or cynical maxim of the Roman emperor, *Deorum iniurias Dis curae*, Tacit. *Ann.* 1. 73. 5.

7. **σφέων αὐτῶν πέρι ἐφρόντιζον**: little expecting a miraculous intervention on their own account, or that the defence and preservation of the *ἱρὰ χρήματα* would compass their own.

τέκνα . . καὶ γυναῖκας: cp. cc. 4, 40. The *οἰκέται* are to be understood.

8. **πέρην ἐς τὴν Ἀχαιίην**: no doubt by sea; a better asylum than Amphissa, where the majority of the Phokians had taken refuge, and might now think themselves lucky if they escaped the Persians and Thessalians; see *infra*.

αὐτῶν δέ is emphatically masculine.

ἀνέβησαν ἐς τοῦ Παρνησοῦ τὰς κορυφὰς καὶ ἐς τὸ Κωρύκιον ἄντρον ἀνηνείκαντο, οἳ δὲ ἐς Ἄμφισσαν τὴν Λοκρίδα ὑπεξῆλθον. πάντες δὲ ὦν οἱ Δελφοὶ ἐξέλιπον τὴν πόλιν, πλὴν ἑξήκοντα
37 *ἀνδρῶν καὶ τοῦ προφήτεω. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀγχοῦ ἦσαν οἱ βάρβαροι ἐπιόντες καὶ ἀπώρων τὸ ἱρόν, ἐν τούτῳ ὁ προφήτης, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Ἀκήρατος, ὁρᾷ πρὸ τοῦ νηοῦ ὅπλα προκείμενα*

---

9 *παρνησσοῦ* **B** 10 *ἀνηνείκατο* C || *ἄμφισαν* C 11 *ἐξέλειπον* B
37. 1 *ἐπείτε δὲ?* van H. || *ἀγχοῦ τε* **B**, Holder, van H. 2 *ἀπώρεον* CP*dz*

---

9. **τοῦ Παρνησοῦ τὰς κορυφάς** looks like 'the twin peaks,' but is probably used more generally; cp. 9. 104 *σῴζωνται ἐς τὰς κορυφὰς τῆς Μυκάλης*. The Phokians had, some of them, gone up *ἐς τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ Παρνησοῦ* c. 32 *supra*; but there was plenty of room on the heights and peaks of Parnassos for Phokians and Delphians.

τὸ Κωρύκιον ἄντρον: the Korykian cavern, an immense hollow in the limestone, but of less extent and mystery than our own caves in the Peak (*καὶ ἔστιν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ὁδεῦσαι δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄνευ λαμπτήρων* Pausan. 10. 32. 7), is reached from Delphi by ascending above the 'Phaidriades' on a very steep path into the upper plateau, still well-wooded, beyond which rises a steep conical and rocky hill, near the top of which the entrance to the cavern may be detected. (A scramble of twenty-five minutes took me up this hill on April 7, 1899.) It was sacred to Pan and to the Nymphs, Pausan. *l.c.*, Strabo 417.

10. **ἀνηνείκαντο**, *ibidem*; c. 32 *supra*.

ἐς Ἄμφισσαν τὴν Λοκρίδα: there they would foregather with the mass of the Phokian refugees; cp. c. 32 *supra*. The absence of any cross reference, and the repeated yet different description of Amphissa, confirm the opinion that this story of the preservation of Delphi is an independent narrative, from a different source, and of later composition and insertion in the main draft of the work; cp. c. 35. 8 *supra*.

11. **δὲ ὦν**, 'one way or another.'

πλὴν ἑξήκοντα ἀνδρῶν: why 60? Was that the number of the Delphian Council, perhaps, at this date, an aristocratic body, and did it remain, like the Roman curule magistrates and senators, at the coming of the Gauls? cp. Livy 5. 41. (The political constitution of the Delphic state is an enigma; the history of Delphi is best given by H. Pomtow *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa iv. 1901, 2517 ff.)

12. **καὶ τοῦ προφήτεω**: his name is supplied just below, Akeratos. It is a little surprising that the 'prophet' and not the 'Pythia' is there. The exact function of the Delphian, or Pythian, *προφήτης* is obscure; he is presumably at the head of the Delphian hierarchy, but whether an *ἱερεύς* or not, whether a sole official or with a colleague or colleagues, are questions hardly to be answered positively, least of all for the earlier period. The 'prophet' or 'priest' would be distinct anyway from the five *ὅσιοι* mentioned by Plutarch, *Mor.* 438 (with the *προφήτης*) and 292 (*πέντε δέ εἰσι Ὅσιοι διὰ βίου καὶ τὰ πολλὰ μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν* (*sic*) *δρῶσιν οὗτοι, καὶ συνιερουργοῦσιν, ἅτε γεγονέναι δοκοῦντες ἀπὸ Δευκαλίωνος*); like them, and the Pythia herself, the 'prophets' would hold office for life.

37. 1. **ἀγχοῦ ἦσαν . . καὶ ἀπώρων**: a parataxis. Apparently they never entered the sacred precincts, but just came within sight of the temple. They would have to come pretty near to be in sight, owing to the way in which the cliffs project on the road from Arachova. With *ἀπώρων* cp. *ἀπιδόντες* 9. 69.

2. **ὁ προφήτης, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Ἀκήρατος**, see note previous chapter. The name is rare as a proper name, though common enough as an epithet, a fine one for a prophet or a priest (*integer*, pure, unmixed, undefiled).

3. **ὁρᾷ**: graphic present: **πρό**, very distinctly of place. The **νηός** here would denote the whole structure, including the peristyle. The arms would have been lying before the east front of the temple, in the open space on the terrace

ἔσωθεν ἐκ τοῦ μεγάρου ἐξενηνειγμένα ἱρά, τῶν οὐκ ὅσιον ἦν ἅπτεσθαι ἀνθρώπων οὐδενί. ὁ μὲν δὴ ἤιε Δελφῶν τοῖσι παρεοῦσι σημανέων τὸ τέρας· οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι ἐπειδὴ ἐγίνοντο ἐπειγόμενοι κατὰ τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Προναίης Ἀθηναίης, *ἐπιγίνεταί σφι τέρεα ἔτι μέζονα τοῦ πρὶν γενομένου τέρεος. θῶμα μὲν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο κάρτα ἐστί, ὅπλα ἀρήια αὐτόματα φανῆναι*

---

4 *ἐξενηνεγμένα* **α** ‖ *ἱρά* : *ἀρήια* Naber 5 *ἀνθρώπω* **β** ‖ *ἦε* C 7 *προνηΐης* RV, Holder, van H. : *προνοιΐης* Sz 8 *γεγενημένου* **β**z ‖ *τέρεος* del. van H. ‖ *θῶμα* **α**, Stein[2], van H. : *θώυμα* **β** : *θῶυμα* Stein[1], Holder ‖ *μὲν* om. **β**

---

where now are the remains of the Altar of the Chians (see plan, Frazer v. 258).

4. **τῶν οὐκ ὅσιον ἦν**: they were *ἀκίνητα*; cp. c. 36 *supra*.

5. **ὁ μὲν δὴ ἤιε**: he was evidently in the temple precincts; the 'sixty' were elsewhere.

6. **τὸ τέρας**: a marvel, sign, *in abstracto*; cp. 6. 98 *τέρας ἀνθρώποισι τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι κακῶν ἔφαινε ὁ Θεός*. Down below *τέρεα* seems to be used in a slightly more concrete sense, of actual *φάσματα*, as certainly c. 27 *supra*, if the reading stand. Similar portents assured the courage of the Thebans before Leuktra: Xenophon, *Hell.* 6. 4. 7 *ἀπηγγέλλετο δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῖς ὡς οἵ τε νεῴ πάντες αὐτόματοι ἀνεῴγοντο, αἵ τε ἱέρειαι λέγοιεν ὡς νίκην οἱ θεοὶ φαίνοιεν. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου καὶ τὰ ὅπλα ἔφασαν ἀφανῆ εἶναι, ὡς τοῦ Ἡρακλέους εἰς τὴν μάχην ἐξωρμημένου.* Xenophon, who, though pious, is no friend to Thebes, adds: *οἱ μὲν δή τινες λέγουσιν ὡς ταῦτα πάντα τεχνάσματα ἦν τῶν προεστηκότων.*

7. **κατά**: of place; in the vicinity of, in a line with, over against.

τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Προναίης Ἀθηναίης. This temple has now been identified by M. Homolle, and excavated; see *J.H.S.* xxi. (1901) 347. It was the last of five buildings on the left of the road from Arachova to Delphi, which formed an important group, or row, outside the Pythian sanctuary itself, at a spot known as the *Marmaria*, halfway between the *Logari* and the *gymnasium*. The first of these buildings was in ruins at the time of Pausanias, the other four he mentions. The temple of Athene is now identified, not with the Rotunda or *tholos* (as by Laurent), but with a temple *in antis*, built of local limestone, the last of the five (*πεντέλοιπος*!) and therefore rightly *πρόναιος*, which agrees with the description of ps.-Demosth. *Or.* 25. 34 *παρὰ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐν Δελφοῖς κάλλιστος καὶ μέγιστος νεὼς εὐθὺς εἰσιόντι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν.* That Προναία (cp. 1. 92, where the same temple is mentioned) is the official title of the goddess at Delphi is proved by inscriptions; albeit *προνοία* is a frequent variant, found apparently in Pausanias 10. 8. 7, and therefore followed by J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias*, v. 251.

8. **θῶμα**: a more generic term than *τέρας*, and probably more 'subjective,' or psychological, at least in 'origin.' Hdt.'s method of describing the portent, miracle, apparition, godsend—perhaps in close loyalty to his source—is remarkable, and suggests some antecedent challenge, doubt, discussion. (*a*) There is a *crescendo*, a climax, from *τέρας* to *τέρεα ἔτι μέζονα*, and so on. (*b*) Thrice is the exact locality of the apparition indicated, *κατὰ τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Προναίης Ἀθηναίης* (*bis*), *ἐν τῷ τεμένεϊ τ. Π. Ἀ.* (*c*) His grammar becomes slightly disordered, as not infrequently, at moments of excitation: *οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι . . ἐπιγίνεταί σφι.* (*d*) He urges the case for marvelling the more: *θῶμα μὲν γὰρ . . ἄξια θωμάσαι μάλιστα.* (*e*) He adduces as evidence confirmatory of the miracle the stones still lying in the close of Athene. (*f*) He cites the Persians themselves as witnesses for *ἄλλα θεῖα* sc. *φάσματα*, sc. *θώματα* sc. *τέρεα*. One cannot but admire the courage with which Delphi, when censured for its escape in the Persian war, knew how to defend itself. It is likely that the critique had been mainly an Athenian one; if so, Delphi called Athene Pronaia herself as chief witness for the defence, and Athene Pronaia, or Pronoia, was justified of her children. Cp. Appendix III. § 4.

ἔξω προκείμενα τοῦ νηοῦ· τὰ δὲ δὴ ἐπὶ τούτῳ δεύτερα
ἐπιγενόμενα καὶ διὰ πάντων φασμάτων ἄξια θωμάσαι μάλιστα.
ἐπεὶ γὰρ δὴ ἦσαν ἐπιόντες οἱ βάρβαροι κατὰ τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς
Προναίης Ἀθηναίης, ἐν τούτῳ ἐκ μὲν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κεραυνοὶ
αὐτοῖσι ἐνέπιπτον, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Παρνησοῦ ἀπορραγεῖσαι δύο
κορυφαὶ ἐφέροντο πολλῷ πατάγῳ ἐς αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέβαλον
συχνούς σφεων, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἱροῦ τῆς Προναίης βοή τε καὶ
38 *ἀλαλαγμὸς ἐγίνετο. συμμιγέντων δὲ τούτων πάντων, φόβος*
τοῖσι βαρβάροισι ἐνεπεπτώκεε. μαθόντες δὲ οἱ Δελφοὶ φεύ-
γοντας σφέας, ἐπικαταβάντες ἀπέκτειναν πλῆθός τι αὐτῶν.
οἱ δὲ περιεόντες ἰθὺ Βοιωτῶν ἔφευγον. ἔλεγον δὲ οἱ ἀπονο-

---

11 *ἐπιγενόμενα* Pz, Stein[2]: *ἐπιγινόμενα* **α**, Stein[1]: *γινόμενα* **β** ‖ *θωμάσαι* **α**, Stein[2], van H.: *θωυμάσαι* **β**, Stein[1], Holder 12 *ἐπείτε*? van H. 13 *προνηΐης* R, Holder, van H.: *προνοιΐης* SVz 14 *παρνησοῦ* **α**: *παρνησσοῦ* ‖ *ἀπορραγῆσαι* **α** 15 *κατέβαλον* Reiske, Stein[2], van H.: *κατέλαβον* 16 *προνηΐης* **β**, Holder, van H.: *προνοιΐης* SVz (*νηοῦ* add. V) **38.** 1 *συμμισγέντων* C 3 *τι*: *τε* **β** 4 *ἰθὺ* **β**z: *εὐθὺ*

---

10. **δεύτερα**, 'next,' but not inferior.

11. **διὰ πάντων**: in the whole catalogue (number, series) of . . ; cp. 1. 25 of the krater of Glaukes the Chian, *θέης ἄξιον διὰ πάντων τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖσι ἀναθημάτων*. Also 7. 83 *supra*.

13. **ἐν τούτῳ**: sc. *τῷ χρόνῳ*.

κεραυνοί: *fulmina*; thunderbolts, strictly material and massive (like the rocks themselves), and not the mere flashes of lightning (*στεροπαί*, *fulgura*) much less the mere crash or rumble of thunder (*βρονταί*, *tonitrus*). A thunderbolt can strike a ship: *Od.* 14. 305 *ἔμβαλε νηῒ κεραυνόν* etc.

14. **δύο κορυφαί**: not *αἱ δ. κ.* but simply two 'peaks' or pointed rocks; cp. *τοῦ Παρνησοῦ τὰς κορυφάς* c. 36 *supra*, which cannot be supposed to have fallen on the Persians.

16. **βοή τε καὶ ἀλαλαγμός**, 'war-whoop and battle-cry'—a distinction without a difference: *βοή* is perhaps more generic. *ἀλαλάζειν* is to utter a specific cry, *ἀλαλαί*. Perhaps this is a cry of victory; cp. *νίκην ὁρμῶντα ἀλαλάξαι* Soph. *Antig.* 133. Pindar uses *ἀλαλά* (*ἀλαλή*) *Nem.* 3. 60, *Isth.* 6. (7.) 10, which L. & S. render 'the cry with which battle was begun,' and Rumpel (*Lex. Pind.* (1883) p. 25) *clamor bellicus*. Most remarkable is the personification Pindar *Fr.* 78 (225) *κλῦθ' Ἀλαλὰ Πολεμοῦ θύγατερ*. The words *ἀλαλάζειν et cog.* of course came to be used for any loud cry, shout, etc. *ἐλελίζειν* is to raise the cry *ἐλελεῦ*, a battle-cry still, but a thinner, shriller one than *ἀλαλαί*, while *ὀλολύζειν*—the cry *ὀλολύ*—is distinctly womanish: *ὠλόλυξαν μὲν αἱ γυναῖκες, ἠλάλαξαν δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες* Heliod. 3. 5.

We cry the cry still in our borrowed *Allelu-jah*; but it is only the 'Salvation Army' which uses it as a 'war-cry.'

38. 1. **συμμιγέντων**: more forcible than *συμπεσόντων*, *συνελθόντων*. It is only *τὰ μέζονα τέρεα*, not *τὸ πρὶν γενόμενον τέρας*, that could strictly be included in the *μίξις*. The new-comers would not know the miracle of the arms.

φόβος . . ἐνεπεπτώκεε, 'a panic possessed them': the pluperfect tense is rather rhetorical and stylistic than strictly temporal, much less past, in its effects. The *φόβος* is of course *θεῖόν τι*.

2. **οἱ Δελφοὶ . . ἐπικαταβάντες**: that is, of course, from the peaks of Parnassos and the Korykian cavern, c. 36 *supra*, but not before the Persians were in panic-stricken flight.

3. **πλῆθός τι**: the exact number of the Persians slain on this occasion would surely have been noted and remembered were the episode itself historical. This numerical vagueness is another nail in the coffin of this dead history.

4. **ἰθὺ Βοιωτῶν**: *ex hypothesi* by the

στήσαντες οὗτοι τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, ὡς πρὸς
τούτοισι καὶ ἄλλα ὥρων θεῖα· δύο γὰρ ὁπλίτας μεζόνως ἢ
κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπων φύσιν ἔχοντας ἕπεσθαί σφι κτείνοντας καὶ
διώκοντας. τούτους δὲ τοὺς δύο Δελφοὶ λέγουσι εἶναι ἐπι- 39
χωρίους ἥρωας Φύλακόν τε καὶ Αὐτόνοον, τῶν τὰ τεμένεα

6 μεζόνως : μέζονας codd., Stein, van H. : 'aut μεζόνως legendum aut μέζονα aut tandem delendum ἔχοντας' Reiske : μεζόνως Holder : μέζονα ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον Wesseling : ἔχοντας secl. Stein, van H. : ἐόντας pro ἔχοντας coni. Koen : μέζονας ἢ κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον ἕπεσθαί vult Cobet : κατὰ ACz 39. 1 εἶναι post ἥρωας Pz

way they had come, which would bring them down to Daulia, and so to Panopeus and to Orchomenos, where they may have rejoined—or have joined—the army. Perhaps Xerxes himself crossed Parnassos from Lilaia to Delphi, and so to Daulia and Panopeus, and there rejoined the main body of the army; cp. c. 34 *supra*.

ἔλεγον . . οἱ ἀπονοστήσαντες . . ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι. Where did Hdt. get this information? Was it from Thersandros of Orchomenos, who seems to have made it his business to collect, or to relate (*ex eventu*), the signs of Persian pessimism and panic in the war (cp. 9. 16); or was it from the Delphians, who, of course, could easily have gotten the information from Greeks in the Persian camp? The story was certainly to be heard at Delphi, for the Delphians interpreted it to Hdt.—and we can hardly suppose that he first told the facts to the Delphians and asked for the interpretation.

5. **πρὸς τούτοισι καὶ ἄλλα ὥρων θεῖα**: in addition there were other manifestations of a supernatural order. ὁρᾶν is used in an extended sense, for there had been πάταγος, βοή, ἀλαλαγμός, φόβος, φυγή, τραύματα, besides φάσματα. Even their experiences with these further apparitions are not confined to ὄψεις.

7. **ἀνθρώπων φύσιν**: φύσις is 'growth,' hence 'stature,' for which φυή is the more usual term, which, *vice versa*, is used at times as = φύσις, in the usual senses. Each exchange is poetic, and chiefly to be illustrated from Pindar; cp. Rumpel, *Lexicon, sub vv.* The text is here in doubt; cp. App. Crit. Reiske's suggestion, adopted by Holder, is supported by Isokrates, 9. 21 τὰς μὲν φήμας καὶ τὰς μαντείας καὶ τὰς ὄψεις τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις γενομένας, ἐξ ὧν μειζόνως ἂν φανείη γεγονὼς ἢ κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον, αἱροῦμαι παραλιπεῖν κτλ., for if we may say μειζόνως ἢ κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι we may say μειζόνως ἔχειν ἢ κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπων φύσιν.

καὶ διώκοντας seems rather weak, but is added to explain why any escaped.

39. 1. **Δελφοὶ λέγουσι**: it hardly needs this late indication to prove the story of the miraculous preservation of the Delphians, their temple and its treasures, a local Delphian legend, in the last resort. The phrase in itself would not prove that Hdt. had gleaned information in Delphi, but the context below points to that conclusion.

2. **Φύλακόν τε καὶ Αὐτόνοον**: Phylakos has a significant name (cp. φύλακος 1. 84 *et passim*), which is also a genuine *proprium*, cp. c. 85 *infra*. In the *Iliad* (besides a 'Trojan' of the name, 6. 35) Podarkes, leader of the Thessalians, is son of Iphiklos, and grandson of Phylakos (heroic founder of Phylake), 2. 695–705, and the name reappears in *Od.* 15. 231. Could the Delphian 'Phylakos' be, after all, a Thessalian hero, and a further witness of the early period of Thessalian predominance in Delphi?

Autonoos, the name of a Danaan slain by Hektor, *Il.* 11. 301, is also found on the 'Trojan' side, *Il.* 16. 694 (a hero slain by Patroklos). But again the name appears in historic times in Thessaly, Polyb. 7. 5. 3.

τῶν τὰ τεμένεα: the 'closes' of these heroes were in the vicinity of the Pythian sanctuary; that of Phylakos hard by the road (from Delphi to *Arachova* and Daulia) along which the Persians fled, and so on higher ground than the temple of Pronaia Athene; that of Autonoos 'nigh Kastalia, the famous spring and burn close under the Hyampeian peak.' A small building, one of two discovered in the excavation of the Marmaria, has been conjecturally identi-

ἐστὶ περὶ τὸ ἱρόν, Φυλάκου μὲν παρ᾽ αὐτὴν τὴν ὁδὸν κατύπερθε τοῦ ἱροῦ τῆς Προναίης, Αὐτονόου δὲ πέλας τῆς Κασταλίης ὑπὸ τῇ Ὑαμπείῃ κορυφῇ. οἱ δὲ πεσόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Παρνησοῦ λίθοι ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ἦσαν σόοι, ἐν τῷ τεμένεϊ τῆς Προναίης Ἀθηναίης κείμενοι, ἐς τὸ ἐνέσκηψαν διὰ τῶν βαρβάρων φερόμενοι. τούτων μέν νυν τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὕτη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱροῦ ἀπαλλαγὴ γίνεται.

4 *προνηΐης* R : *προνοιΐης* SV*z* 6 *παρνησοῦ* **a** : *παρνησσοῦ* || *ἔσαν* *z* || *σῶοι* CP*z* || *τεμένει* AB 7 *προνηΐης* R : *προνοιΐης* SV*z* || *ἀνέσκηψαν* B : *ἐνεσκήψαντο* **B**

fied with the Phylakion (*J. H. S.* xxi. 1901, p. 347), which would thus appear to have been on the same side of the road as the Athenaion. Pausanias 10. 8. 7 describes the *Φυλάκου τέμενος* as *πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Προνοίης* (*sic*). For the temenos of Autonoos see next note. Thirlwall (ii. 326) assumes that these dedications were made in consequence of the events of 480 B.C., but there is nothing in Hdt. to suggest that (cp. *contra* 7. 189).

5. **Κασταλίης**: Pausan. 10. 8. 9 *ἐκ δὲ τοῦ γυμνασίου τὴν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν ἀνιόντι ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς ὁδοῦ τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς Κασταλίας, καὶ πιεῖν ἡδύ.* There has never been any doubt as to the identification of 'the water of Castaly' (cp. the exhaustive note in Frazer, *Pausanias* v. 255); but the shrine of the hero Autonoos has not yet been certainly identified, and is not even mentioned by Pausanias. "Leake thought that the little chapel of St. John hewn in the rock above the pool might be the precinct of the hero Autonoos. . . M. Foucart prefers to suppose that the precinct stood on a small platform between the pool and the road. Bursian thought he recognised a piece of the wall which had enclosed the precinct," Frazer *l.c.* (Bursian i. 172, says dogmatically enough: *In der Nähe der Quelle war das Temenos des Heros Autonoos, von welchem noch ein Stück der Umfangsmauer erhalten ist.*)

τῇ Ὑαμπείῃ κορυφῇ: Hyampeia is the sheer wall of rock rising into a peaked summit a thousand feet or so above the road and the spring, and forming the right or eastern wall of the gorge or chasm in which the Kastalian waters arise. A similar peak flanks the narrow chasm on the other side, but the ancient name thereof has not been preserved. It cannot possibly be these two *κορυφαί* which earned Parnassos the title of 'biceps' (cp. c. 32 *supra*), for they are purely local features in the Delphian landscape, and can never have been mistaken for the actual summits of the mountain, to one of which Hdt. has already and correctly assigned a name (c. 32 *supra*, if the passage be not a gloss); Pape-Benseler's *Wörterbuch*, ii. 1573 *sub v.*, achieves indeed the confusion, or seems to do so (*eine der beiden Bergspitzen des Parnassos in der Nähe von Delphi*). Strabo 424 mentions Hyampeia *ἐν τῷ Παρνασσῷ* only to distinguish it from *Ὑάμπολις* or *Ὕα* (cp. c. 33 *supra*). Plutarch, *Mor.* 557, reports that the Delphians executed Aisopos (cp. Hdt. 2. 134) *ὤσαντες ἀπὸ τῆς πέτρας ἐκείνης ἣν Ὑάμπειαν καλοῦσιν.*

6. **ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ἦσαν σόοι**, and, for aught known, to the present day also: for the ground about there, below the road, is strewn with *λίθοι*, large and smaller, all of which have doubtless descended from Parnassos. The phrase has the note of Hdt.'s 'autopsy,' and the argument the stamp, alas! of Hdt.'s logic. He seems to think the stones an evidence of the truth of the story. It was, perhaps, the position of these stones which determined the point reached by the Persians in their "sacrilegious enterprise."

8. **τούτων . . αὕτη . . ἀπαλλαγή**: in sharpest contrast to the usual departure of good men, even non-Hellenes, who came to worship, to seek advice and consolation, to assist at the *ἀγών* or other solemn function, and went their way rejoicing.

9. **γίνεται** puts us *en rapport* with the story and the story-tellers, rather than with the Persians and their *exeunt.* The story is verily a test one; it is one

Ὁ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ναυτικὸς στρατὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου **40**
Ἀθηναίων δεηθέντων ἐς Σαλαμῖνα κατίσχει [τὰς νέας]. τῶνδε

---

40. 2 *κατασχεῖν* **B** || *τὰς νέας* secl. Stein³ : *τὰς νῆας* **B** || *τῶνδε* : *τῶν* RS, Schaefer

---

of the most transparent fictions in Hdt., though one that fully imposed on the good man himself. The early Victorian rationalists made sad work of it, of whom the Rev. Professor Rawlinson may in this case be taken as typical. He (iv.³ 291) interprets the story as follows: — (1) The fragments of rock "were carefully prepared beforehand," and precipitated by the men on the "peaks." (2) In falling the rocks made a noise, which was mistaken for "thunder." (3) The armour in front of the temple was arranged by a priest. (4) The war-cry was a shout from another priest. (5) The heroes were impersonated by "two men of unusual stature," or (6) may have been "a mere excuse" made to Xerxes by his men. Such is the last word of unhistorical criticism upon uncritical history. It may not be possible to determine exactly what took place at Delphi in 480 B.C., or whether the Persians had any direct relations with Delphi, or ever visited it at all; but two points may here at least be urged. (i.) The story just examined (cc. 35–39) is evidently *apologetic*, i.e. told and devised in order to explain the suspicious escape of Delphi in the war. (ii.) It must not be isolated, and considered merely on its own merits, but must be brought into relation with (*a*) the evidences in regard to the whole attitude and policy and action of Delphi throughout the great crisis, and even in other similar crises; (*b*) the evidences for the policy of the Persians towards the Greeks, and especially towards the 'medizers,' who were as much interested in Delphi as any others; (*c*) the accounts preserved in Pausanias (1. 4. 4, 10. 23) of the attack of the Gauls upon Delphi in the year 279 B.C., and the part played by the 'divine' in that second deliverance. For an attempt to appreciate the story from that point of view cp. Appendix III. § 4.

40. 1. ὁ δὲ Ἑλ. ν. στ. ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου: the narrative is resumed from c. 21 or 22 *supra*, or even from the words *Θεμιστοκλέης μὲν ταῦτα ἐνέγραψε* in c. 23. The present tense *κατίσχει* anticipates much of the intervening narrative, the arrival of the Hellenic fleet "at Salamis" doubtless preceding the advance of the Persian forces from Thermopylai. The Greek fleet might well have arrived at the Salaminian station within forty-eight hours of quitting Artemision. If it left Artemision on Tuesday night (as it were) it might easily have reached Salamis in the course of Thursday morning. The words *ἀπὸ τ. Ἀρτ.* might be taken loosely to qualify *ὁ . . στρατός*, or might be loosely constructed with *κατίσχει*, or might seem to desiderate a participle, e.g. *ἀπαχθείς*. For *κατίσχει* cp. 6. 101, and App. Crit.

2. Ἀθηναίων δεηθέντων. It is generally assumed that in the conception of Hdt. and his sources the station at Salamis was no part of the general plan of defence, but an after-thought, and an impromptu. To what extent is this assumption binding? What event called for an improvisation? The failure at Thermopylai? Or the non-appearance of the Peloponnesian forces in Boiotia? Had the full levy of the land-forces been, as was expected, already north of Kithairon, or even of the Isthmos, where better could the Greek fleet have halted than in the straits of Salamis? What appears to have taken the Athenians by surprise was that a situation had been allowed to arise in which the complete evacuation of Attica had become at least an open question. It is here that I would insert the story of the consultation of the Delphic oracle told, anachronistically, 7. 140-143 *supra*.

τῶνδε δὲ εἵνεκα. Hdt.'s motivation in this passage is curious, and perhaps involves a *hysteron-proteron*. He treats the evacuation of Attica as a foregone conclusion, and the problem of the *quid agendum* as only starting from that *fait accompli*. But **τὸ ποιητέον ἔσται** covers all that and much more (*τό*, of course, relative). Had the Peloponnesian forces been in Boiotia (as was expected), the evacuation of Attica would not have been in question, but Salamis might still have been the natural halting-place for the fleet, covering, as it would have done, the land-forces in Boiotia from the rear, or flank. But so far from the

δὲ εἵνεκα προσεδεήθησαν αὐτῶν σχεῖν πρὸς Σαλαμῖνα Ἀθηναῖοι, ἵνα αὐτοὶ παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας ὑπεξαγάγωνται ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, πρὸς δὲ καὶ βουλεύσωνται τὸ ποιητέον αὐτοῖσι ἔσται. ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῖσι κατήκουσι πρήγμασι βουλὴν ἔμελλον ποιήσασθαι ὡς ἐψευσμένοι γνώμης. δοκέοντες γὰρ εὑρήσειν Πελοποννησίους πανδημὶ ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίῃ ὑποκατημένους τὸν βάρβαρον, τῶν μὲν εὗρον οὐδὲν ἐόν, οἳ δὲ ἐπυνθάνοντο τὸν Ἰσθμὸν αὐτοὺς τειχέοντας, ὡς τὴν Πελοπόννησον περὶ πλείστου τε ποιευμένους περιεῖναι καὶ ταύτην ἔχοντας ἐν φυλακῇ, τὰ

4 *ἵν'* C || *αὐτοὶ* om. **ß** 7 *ποιήσεσθαι* **ß**Pz, Holder, van H. 8 *πελοπονησίους* R || *πανδημεὶ* **ß**, Stein 9 *τῶν, οἱ μὲν* z 10 *ὡς τὴν* Stein[2], van H. : *τὴν* **α**, Stein[1], Holder : *καὶ τὴν* **ß** : *ἐς τὴν* Pz : *εἰς τὴν* C || *πελοπόνησον* R 11 *τε* post *περιεῖναι* **ß** || *ποιευμένους* R : *ποιεομένους* || *τἄλλα* **ß** : *τἆλλα* z, Holder : *τὰ δὲ ἄλλα* van H.

complete evacuation of Attica being a self-obvious necessity, it was even now not really adopted or fully carried out, cp. c. 51 *infra*. Moreover, there would be the question, even in the case of the women and children (*παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας*, cp. cc. 36 *supra*, 41, 44, 60 *infra*), to what place or places they were to be conveyed. These are all matters for separate deliberation by the Athenians alone (it is not possible to refer *αὐτοὶ* and *αὐτοῖσι* to different persons); but they leave the purely strategic plan of occupying the straits of Salamis untouched.

6. **τοῖσι κατήκουσι πρήγμασι** (cp. c. 19 *supra*) may cover the evacuation of Artemision, but refers primarily to the news that the Peloponnesians, instead of being in full force beyond Kithairon, are busy fortifying the Isthmos. This news required formal deliberation, and the situation was discussed in Athens by the *βουλή* and *ἐκκλησία* (*βουλεύσωνται, βουλὴν ποιήσασθαι*, cp. 9. 5 *infra*). The term **Ἀθηναῖοι** in this passage may be somewhat loosely used to merge the *στρατηγοί* in the general mass of citizens. One might suspect that Themistokles was less taken by surprise (**ἐψευσμένοι γνώμης**, *n.b.* the perfect or pluperfect participle) than the majority of Athenians.

7. **δοκέοντες . . τὸν βάρβαρον**: there must have been good reason for this expectation; in other words, the plan of defence must have comprised a second stand for the protection of Attica, even if Phokis and Boiotia might have to be abandoned. The phraseology here involves more than the supposition that the Peloponnesians might reasonably have been expected to be on the march for Thermopylai: *εὑρήσειν, πανδημί, ὑποκατημένους*, all go beyond that. The participle here scarcely implies an ambuscade, but it certainly implies a settlement or resting-place; cp. 7. 27. The adverb signifies the *levée en masse* such as afterwards fought at Plataia; the verb may have an immaterial or purely psychological force (as *εὗρον* just below), i.e. 'to find that the Peloponnesians' etc., or a less figurative and more material meaning ('to find the Peloponnesians posted in wait for the barbarian north of Kithairon'). In either case the futurity is conditioned by the interval between the date of the *δόκησις* and its realisation or disappointment, and can hardly be reproduced in English idiom.

9. **τῶν μὲν . . οἳ δέ**: an inaccurate use of the antithetical particles, produced by the emphatic repetition of the subject; cp. 7. 6 *supra*: the *τῶν* must be neuter. *αὐτοὺς δέ* would have been more in order.

11. **τὰ ἄλλα δὲ ἀπιέναι**: sc. *βουλομένους, νοεόντας*, or some such word, out of *περὶ πλείστου ποιευμένους*, a kind of zeugma. The position of the *δέ* is emphatic, and none the less, that *μέν* has been omitted (*τὴν μὲν* Π.). Stein takes *ἀπιέναι* as coordinate with *ἔχοντας ἐν φ.* (=*ταύτην μὲν φυλάσσειν*) and cps. 5. 15, where, however, *συναλίσθαι καὶ φυλάσσοντας* is far less harsh than the phrase here, for at least two reasons: (*a*) *πυθόμενοι* can be used regularly with both infinitive and participle; (*b*) the copula *καί* there

ἄλλα δὲ ἀπιέναι. ταῦτα πυνθανόμενοι οὕτω δὴ προσεδεήθησαν σφέων σχεῖν πρὸς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι κατέσχον 41
ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἄπιξιν κήρυγμα ἐποιήσαντο, Ἀθηναίων τῇ τις δύναται σῴζειν τέκνα τε καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας. ἐνθαῦτα οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι ἐς Τροίζηνα ἀπέστειλαν, οἱ δὲ ἐς Αἴγιναν, οἱ δὲ ἐς Σαλαμῖνα. ἔσπευσαν δὲ ταῦτα ὑπεκθέσθαι τῷ χρηστηρίῳ τε βουλόμενοι

---

12 *δὴ* post *ταῦτα* **B**P*z* **41.** 3 *σῴζειν* van H., Stein[3]: *σώιζειν* C: *σώζειν* 4 *τὰ τέκνα* **B***z*, Holder, van H. 6 *ὑπεκθέσθαι* del. Gomperz, Holder

---

makes the co-ordination easier than the *δέ* here.

41. 2. **τὴν Σαλαμῖνα . . τὴν ἑωυτῶν.** Not but what Salamis was also theirs, but it was no part of Attica proper, it never was a 'deme.' (A kleruchy might be 'Athenian' without being 'Attic'; cp. 6. 139 f.) For the Salaminian settlement cp. my note to 5. 77. 9, and Hicks, *Manual*[2] (1901), p. 6.

3. **κήρυγμα ἐποιήσαντο.** This proclamation will have succeeded the decision of *βουλή* and *δῆμος* to abandon Attica, which itself will have followed upon the return of the *θεωρία* from Delphi (7. 140–144). The story told c. 51 *infra* makes it probable that the evacuation of Attica neither was nor was intended to be complete in a strategic sense. To have abandoned city and country without such authorization constituted *προδοσία*, and was a capital crime, as the extant speech of Lykurgos proves—nay, even to convey out of the country into a place of safety *τέκνα τε καὶ οἰκέτας* (cp. *c. Leocrat.* 53). Lykurgos' reply on the case before us is rather rhetorical than technical: § 69 *οὐ γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ἐξέλιπον ἀλλὰ τὸν τόπον μετήλλαξαν.* It is not to be supposed that the Strategoi by themselves either would or could have issued such a proclamation. The terms of the psephism are inaccurately preserved in 7. 144. The psephism there recorded belongs to a much earlier stage; cp. note *ad l.*

4. **οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι ἐς Τροίζηνα:** the passage is not free from ambiguity. Are we to understand that an actual majority of Athenian households were sent across to Troizen? Or, merely, that the number at Troizen was larger than either the number in Aigina, or the number in Salamis? That any should have been deposited in Aigina at all is remarkable, in view of the recent war (7. 144) and the present jealousies (c. 92 *infra*); that any should have remained in Salamis but fighting men would tend to show that the Athenians by no means despaired of victory. The historic connexion between Athens and Troizen went back to the days when both were members of the Kalaurian amphiktyony (Strabo 204), to which Aigina also had belonged; and the mythic associations were no doubt deepened by the Theseus-legend, which was already fully domiciled in Attica. No state in Peloponnese was so closely connected with Athens as Troizen, which even used the Attic standard of weight; there too Athene and Poseidon had contended for possession and divided the spoil; cp. Head, *H.N.* 371. Yet Troizen, like Aigina, was Dorian; cp. 7. 99 *supra*, 9. 28 *infra*. It is curious that the two vessels on the look-out with the Attic cruiser in 7. 179 f. are from Troizen and Aigina.

6. **τῷ χρηστηρίῳ** can only have been the response, or responses, recorded above, 7. 140—which (as I suggest) were sought and obtained only after the disaster at Thermopylai. This passage, **ἔσπευσαν δὲ ταῦτα . . τὴν ἀκρόπολιν**, will hardly have been written before Hdt.'s first visit to Athens, and may very well be an insertion in the original draft. It is obviously not calculated primarily for an Athenian public: Athenians would be glad to hear of their fathers' derring deeds, but would not look to Hdt. for information on their own current ritual. This passage, then, probably belongs to the 'second draft.' Cp. Introduction, § 9.

ὑπηρετέειν καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦδε εἵνεκα οὐκ ἥκιστα. λέγουσι Ἀθηναῖοι ὄφιν μέγαν φύλακα τῆς ἀκροπόλιος ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ· λέγουσί τε ταῦτα καὶ δὴ ὡς ἐόντι ἐπιμήνια ἐπιτελέουσι προτιθέντες· τὰ δ' ἐπιμήνια μελιτόεσσα ἐστί. αὕτη δὴ ἡ μελιτόεσσα ἐν τῷ πρόσθε αἰεὶ χρόνῳ ἀναισιμουμένη τότε ἦν ἄψαυστος. σημηνάσης δὲ ταῦτα τῆς ἱρείης, μᾶλλόν τι οἱ

---

7 ὑπηρετεῖν **B**, Holder, van H. ‖ τοῦδε : τούτου Pz ‖ εἵνεκεν **B**, van H. 8 ὄφιν : σφι **B** ‖ ἐνδιαιτέεσθαι **B** 9 τε : δὲ **B** ‖ καὶ δὴ καὶ **B**, Holder, van H. ‖ τελέουσι Paris. 1635, z 10 τὰ δ' : τὰ δὲ R ‖ ἔστι μελιτόεσσα **B**, Holder : ἔστι del. Kallenberg ‖ αὕτη δὴ ἡ Stein[2] : αὕτη δ' (δὲ R) ἡ 11 πρόσθεν codd., z ‖ ἐναισιμουμένη **B** 12 τῆς om. R ‖ ἱερείης **a**, Holder

---

7. **λέγουσι Ἀθηναῖοι**: there was no real snake visible; such is the inevitable inference from this passage and the still more explicit phrase below: λέγουσί τε ταῦτα καὶ δὴ ὡς ἐόντι κτλ., a conclusion which only adds point to the Aristophanic gibe: *Lysistr.* 710 ἐξ οὗ τὸν ὄφιν εἶδον τὸν οἰκουρόν ποτε. The οἰκουρὸς ὄφις was no doubt sacred to Athene, and may have been regarded as a symbol, or a reincarnation, of the earth-born Erechtheus; cp. M. P. Nilsson, *J.H.S.* xxi. (1901) p. 329; but in this case the only proof of the real presence of the serpent was the disappearance of the offering, the divine creature, no doubt, being thought to reside in the crypt of the Erechtheion (ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ, cp. c. 55 *infra*). With this story is naturally compared the tale of Bel and the Dragon (*Apocryph. Vet. Test.* ed. Fritzsche (1871) pp. 86 ff.), in which, as here, the serpent himself took the cake. Blakesley (quoting Valckenaer apparently) adds that at Alexandria any one might eat the cakes of Kronos (Athenaeus 110), while the fish-offerings to Atargatis (at Askalon? Athen. 346) were consumed by the priests as a matter of course, and above board, like the ἄρτοι προθέσεως of the Hebrews (cp. προτιθέντες here). The *parataxis* τε . . καί is observable.

9. **ἐπιμήνια ἐπιτελέουσι**: sc. ἱερά. The offering was made once a month (perhaps at the new moon; cp. 6. 57), and in this case took the form of a sweet cake (**μελιτόεσσα**, sc. μᾶζα).

12. **τῆς ἱρείης**: sc. of Athene. The word **σημηνάσης** is consciously used of an official and solemn report; the thing reported is here indeed a 'sign.' **τῆς θεοῦ**, sc. Athene. The untouched cake proved the absence of the snake, the absence of the snake that of the goddess. But how long had the cake remained untouched? Did it generally disappear immediately on oblation? The serpent, as a religious symbol or cult-object, is found broad-cast in Hellas and the Mediterranean area; nor is it confined to that region; serpent-myths were "specially abundant in Egypt and Babylonia" (*Encycl. Bibl.* iv. 4395), and their area may safely be extended so as to include at least India on the one side and Scandinavia on the other. Whether it have a chthonian or an autochthonous reference, embody an oracular mission, or represent the heroic ancestor, be intended to convey a phallic suggestion, or be connected with the charm and mystery of the lithest and subtlest of animal forms; or whether, on the other hand, it serve, in venomous kind, to typify the powers of evil and destruction: whatever its purpose and significance, the serpent has played a long and curious rôle in religious legend and symbolism. Has it not everywhere gained admission? Remarkably enough, the serpent scarcely figures on the monuments of 'Mykenaean Tree and Pillar cult' collected by A. J. Evans (*J.H.S.* xx. 1900, p. 52), but the missing link has been recently supplied (*Annual Br. Sch. Ath.* ix. 1902–3). At Knossos snakes are now to be seen brandished aloft by the Minoan goddess in her star-chamber (is she not Aphrodite Urania? cp. Hdt. 1. 105). At Delphi the dragon (there, then, an evil being) was slain, but immortalized, by Apollo. At Athens the goddess received the snake into her service; it curled round the caduceus of Hermes and the magic

Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ προθυμότερον ἐξέλιπον τὴν πόλιν, ὡς καὶ τῆς θεοῦ ἀπολελοιπυίης τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. ὡς δέ σφι πάντα ὑπεξέκειτο, ἔπλεον ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον.

42 *Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ ἀπ' Ἀρτεμισίου ἐς Σαλαμῖνα κατέσχον τὰς νέας, συνέρρεε καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς πυνθανόμενος ὁ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ναυτικὸς στρατὸς ἐκ Τροίζηνος· ἐς γὰρ Πώγωνα τὸν Τροιζηνίων λιμένα προείρητο συλλέγεσθαι· συνελέχθησάν τε δὴ πολλῷ*

---

13 *προθυμότερον*: *πρότερον* **α** || *ἐξέλειπον* **α** 14 *ἀπολελοποίης* **α**
42. 1 *ἐπείτε δὲ?* van H. || *ἀπὸ* **β** || *εἰς* **β**, Holder 2 *νῆας συνέρεε* **β**
3 *τῶν* **β** 4 *εἴρητο* **β**

---

or medicinal wand of Asklepios. The serpent inspired the oracle of Trophonios at Lebadeia, and dominated the legend of Kadmos at Thebes; appeared in the ritual of Demeter at Eleusis, and contends with the eagle of Zeus on the coins of Elis. The god visited Olympias, the mother of Alexander, in the form of a snake (Plutarch, *Alex.* 2), and twin-snakes led the son safely through the wilderness to the temple of his divine sire (Arrian, *Anab.* 3. 3. 5). The snake-symbol, the *ἀγαθὸς δαίμων*, preserved the walls of Pompeii (and many another city) from impurity; the serpent figures on the monuments of Mithras, with the bull, the hound, and the scorpion, as a sacred mystery. The bronze serpent which, raised upon a mast, had stayed the plague in the wilderness for the Israelites, was worshipped till a reforming king destroyed the idol, and an idealizing legend identified the serpent's image with the Evil One, who had seduced the mother of mankind beside the tree of knowledge. Henceforth, for Hebrew and for orthodox Christian thought the snake-symbol is *nehustan*; but the earlier associations of tree and serpent were apparently beneficent. As round the world-ash in the *Edda* twines the great snake, Igdrasil, so the Attic serpent may have coiled round the sacred olive of Athene in the Erechtheion; cp. the remarkable representation, reproduced in Baumeister, *Denkmaeler* iii. 1394, fig. 1542.

μᾶλλόν τι . . καὶ προθυμότερον. The phrase betrays the reluctance and opposition to the evacuation of the land and the abandonment of the city, which is more clearly indicated above 7. 142, and c. 51 *infra*.

15. **ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον**: at Salamis.

42. 1. **οἱ ἀπ' Ἀρτεμισίου**: cp. c. 40 *supra*, now including the Athenians.

ἐς Σαλαμῖνα: the sixth occurrence of the phrase since the beginning of c. 40. It is no wise clear whether Hdt. means 'the island' or the town, or whether he draws any distinction between them. For a moment the Greek naval forces had been in three divisions: (i.) the Athenians in Attica, (ii.) the rest of the fleet from Artemision in Salamis, (iii.) the reserves at Troizen. These three divisions are now united at Salamis, a movement which seems to imply a definite plan to make a stand in the Straits. The harbour of Troizen had been previously specified as the rendezvous for the reserves (**προείρητο**) by Sparta, or perhaps by the Congress at the Isthmos, and a summons was sent, or at least intelligence conveyed (**πυνθανόμενος**), from Salamis.

3. **Πώγωνα**: the 'Beard,' so called, perhaps, with some reference to its shape (*εἰς Τροιζῆνα δεῖ βαδίζειν. ἐπὶ τῶν κακογενείων καὶ σπανοπωγώνων εἴρηται. Πώγων γάρ ἐστι λιμὴν εἰς Τροιζῆνα*, Suidas), was the well-sheltered and spacious harbour covered by the island Kalauria (mod. *Poros*) on the coast of Argolis, due south from Aigina and Salamis. Troizen itself (a city sacred to Poseidon) was situate inland, some fifteen stades from the sea, Strabo 373. Cp. E. Curtius, *Peloponnesos* ii. (1852) 444, and notes to Pausanias, 2. 32, *ap.* Frazer and Hitzig-Bluemner.

4. **πολλῷ πλεῦνες.** According to the lists in Hdt. there were 54 more ships at Salamis than at Artemision, and nine states (Hermione, Ambrakia, Leukas, Naxos, Kythnos, Seriphos, Siphnos, Melos, Kroton) are represented at Salamis but not at Artemision: there

πλεῦνες νέες ἢ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ ἐναυμάχεον καὶ ἀπὸ πολίων πλεύνων. ναύαρχος μέν νυν ἐπῆν ὡυτὸς ὅσπερ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ, Εὐρυβιάδης ὁ Εὐρυκλείδεω ἀνὴρ Σπαρτιήτης, οὐ μέντοι γένεος τοῦ βασιληίου ἐών· νέας δὲ πολλῷ πλείστας τε καὶ ἄριστα πλεούσας παρείχοντο Ἀθηναῖοι.

43 ἐστρατεύοντο δὲ οἵδε· ἐκ μὲν Πελοποννήσου Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἑκκαίδεκα νέας παρεχόμενοι, Κορίνθιοι δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πλήρωμα παρεχόμενοι καὶ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ· Σικυώνιοι δὲ πεντεκαίδεκα παρείχοντο νέας, Ἐπιδαύριοι δὲ δέκα, Τροιζήνιοι δὲ πέντε, Ἑρμιονέες δὲ τρεῖς, ἐόντες οὗτοι

5 νῆες **B** 7 γένεός γε **B**, Holder, van H. 8 νῆας **B** 9 πλωούσας **B**z **43.** 1 οἶδε ABR 2 πελοπονήσου R || νῆας **B**z 3 παρεχόμενοι τὸ secl. van H. : (τὸ **B**, Holder : ὃ **a** : om. Stein) 4 παρείχοντο secl. van H. : παρέσχοντο **B**

is one, and only one absentee, the Opuntian Lokris, which has passed under the dominion of Persia.

7. **Εὐρυβιάδης ὁ Εὐρυκλείδεω**: cp. c. 2 *supra*. The express renomination, with the patronymic repeated, marks less the solemnity of the occasion than the difference of the source. The description here is, indeed, more specific than there, more primitive, and may belong to an older stratum. The data must be ultimately referable to Sparta. The technical term **ναύαρχος** is here used, as against *στρατηγὸς ὁ τὸ μέγιστον κράτος ἔχων supra*, which has a more Athenian sound.

8. **νέας δέ**: between the sentence with *μέν* and the sentence with *δέ* there is here a world of difference and contrast; but the latter would have even more point as the antithesis to the description of Eurybiades in c. 2, *τὸν* <*μὲν*> *στρατηγὸν τὸν τὸ μέγιστον κράτος ἔχοντα παρείχοντο Σπαρτιῆται*. No doubt **ἄριστα πλεούσας** covers the merits of the trierarchs and crew as well as those of the builder.

43. 1. **ἐστρατεύοντο δὲ οἵδε.** There follows the navy-list for Salamis, apparently from a Peloponnesian, perhaps a Spartan, source. Hdt. apparently conceives the actual ships in question to be the very same as fought at Artemision, the increased total being due to pure additions; but some ships had been lost or completely disabled off Euboia (cp. cc. 16, 17 *supra*); the additional numbers must in part represent substitutes, and indicate, therefore, all the greater effort on the part of the Greek states.

2. **Λακεδαιμόνιοι**: 16, an addition of 6, as compared with Artemision.

3. **Κορίνθιοι**: apparently 40. **πλήρωμα**, used of a single ship, denotes the crew (Thuc. 7. 4. 6, 12. 3), but of a fleet, or squadron, as here, and c. 45 *infra*, the full number, the total.

4. **Σικυώνιοι**: 15, an addition of 3. **Ἐπιδαύριοι**: 10, an addition of 2.

5. **Τροιζήνιοι**: 5, the same total. **Ἑρμιονέες**: 3, a fresh contingent. **ἐόντες οὗτοι κτλ.**: an ethnological and historical note which can have had nothing to say to an official navy-list, and comes, presumably, from a wholly different source, some logograph's work. It falls into two parts—a remark upon the Dorians, a remark upon the Dryopes. The former invites comparison with the *locus classicus* in 1. 56, the latter with the similar inset, or aside, in c. 31 *supra*.

There are two marked differences between this passage and 1. 56. (*a*) The chart of the Dorian wanderings is much fuller there than here, both in point of chronology and in point of geography, and therewith the historical *aperçu* is fuller. (*b*) Pindos here, coupled as it is with Erineos, plainly denotes the town in Dryopis, or Doris, of that name; in 1. 56 Pindos no less plainly (*pace* Stein) denotes the great mountain-range to the west of Thessaly. The passage in Bk. 1 is also more explicit on the question of nomenclature, attaching the 'Makedonian' title to the Pindos-station, and the 'Dorian' to Dryopis only.

There is thus a discrepancy between the two passages, at least upon the

πλὴν Ἑρμιονέων Δωρικόν τε καὶ Μακεδνὸν ἔθνος, ἐξ Ἐρινεοῦ τε καὶ Πίνδου καὶ τῆς Δρυοπίδος ὕστατα ὁρμηθέντες. οἱ δὲ

---

second point; the phrase just below, **ὕστατα ὁρμηθέντες**, may be taken to cover the first point implicitly; and if the text is to stand, we must suppose that Hdt. (as not infrequently) lapsed from forgetfulness into a slight inconsequence; for an inconsequence it is, even if Mount Pindos and the town of the same name marked two stations (separated by a considerable interval both spatial and temporal) in the Dorian migration. But are the words **Πίνδου καί** here a gloss, an insertion, a reminiscence, by a mere transcriber of 1. 56? Sense and grammar would be complete without them, and the inconsequence would disappear from the author's text. Failing that solution, we might delete *καί* and read *Πίνδου τῆς Δρυοπίδος*.

The question in any case remains of the repetition, the quasi-dittograph. The composition of the two passages was evidently separated by a considerable interval; but which was the earlier? Probably the fuller and completer passage in Bk. 1 is of later composition in the work of Hdt. Had it stood in its place originally, as it now stands, in relation to this, a reference here backwards would have been natural and sufficient, and in keeping with Hdt.'s practice. This passage, then, distinctly supports the theory that Bks. 7, 8, 9 are of earlier composition than the first and subsequent Books. Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

6. **Δωρικόν τε καὶ Μακεδνόν**: etymologizing is hazardous work, yet connexion between *Μακεδνός* and *Μακεδών* can scarcely be doubted. In 1. 56, where the term is associated with the station of the Dorians on Mount Pindos, in the NW. of Thessaly, a geographical argument for the etymological identification presents itself. This Makedonian station for the Dorians is in truth as far back as the chart or the story of the wandering in 1. 56 really carries us; for the previous stages not only involve a pragmatic blunder (the confusion of Histiaiotis with Pelasgiotis, in order to purge the Dorians of all taint of 'barbarism'), but are also obviously designed to bring back the Dorians to the true fold and cradle of Hellenism in Achaia Phthiotis! It is infinitely more probable that the northern Dorians reached their station on Mount Pindos—within view of Hellas—from Makedonia, than that the ultimate conquerors of the south had been driven out of Phthiotis to start with.

ἐξ Ἐρινεοῦ (τε καὶ τῆς Δρυοπίδος). Erineos is mentioned by Thuc. 1. 107. 2 with Boion and Kytinion, as forming the 'metropolis' of the Lakedaimonians (Pindos is there conspicuous by its absence). Strabo 427 adds Pindos, the old name of which was said to be Akyphas, and makes the tetrapolis *μητρόπολιν τῶν ἁπάντων Δωριέων*. The Dorian Tyrtaios celebrated windy Erineos as the point of departure (*ap.* Strabon. 362; Bergk ii.[4] 8, *F.* 2).

αὐτὸς γὰρ Κρονίων, καλλιστεφάνου πόσις
    Ἥρης
  Ζεὺς Ἡρακλείδαις τήνδε δέδωκε πόλιν·
οἷσιν ἅμα προλιπόντες Ἐρινεὸν ἠνεμόεντα
  εὐρεῖαν Πέλοπος νῆσον ἀφικόμεθα.

The name may be compared with *Ὄλυνθος* and many others derived *ἀπὸ φυτῶν*. Cp. Grassberger, *Ortsnamen*, pp. 221 ff. If Pindar, *Pyth.* 1. 65, describes the Herakleids, or Dorians, as *Πινδόθεν ὀρνύμενοι* (a phrase which Pindaric commentators—Donaldson, Fennell, Mezger, Gildersleeve—leave severely alone), he will have had not the town, not the river, but the mountain in mind (Aigimios was at home in Thessaly).

7. **οἱ δὲ Ἑρμιονέες εἰσὶ Δρύοπες**: the people of Hermion (for its site cp. Thuc. 2. 56. 5) no doubt represented a non-Dorian and a prae-Dorian stock in the Peloponnesos, like the people of Asine in Lakonia, c. 73 *infra*, or like the 'Minyai' of the Lepreatis (*ibid.* 4. 148); but perhaps no more came from Doris-Dryopis than the Lepreatai from Lemnos, unless, indeed, they came with the Dorians. The people of Kythnos too are 'Dryopians,' c. 46 *infra*; and there were 'Dryopians' on the Asiatic side (cp. 1. 146). Karystos in Euboia was 'Dryopian,' Thuc. 7. 57. 4, and also perhaps Styra (Pausan. 4. 34. 11, despite Thuc. *l.c.*, who makes them 'Ionian'). Even Kypros—if Diod. 4. 37. 2 were to be believed—contained Dryopians. That the name Dryopis was most clearly attached to the soil in the Oitaian region argues Oita as a real

Ἑρμιονέες εἰσὶ Δρύοπες, ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέος τε καὶ Μηλιέων ἐκ
44 τῆς νῦν Δωρίδος καλεομένης χώρης ἐξαναστάντες. οὗτοι μέν νυν Πελοποννησίων ἐστρατεύοντο, οἵδε δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔξω ἠπείρου, Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους παρεχόμενοι νέας ὀγδώκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν, μοῦνοι. ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γὰρ οὐ συνεναυ-

8 ἡρακλέους **B** 44. 2 οἵδε δὲ Schweighaeuser, van H., Stein³ : οἱ δὲ 3 νῆας **B**

seat of the Dryopians, and may help to explain its 'metropolitan' character. Busolt i.² (1893) 209 connects Dryops, 'oak-man,' with the Lapith 'Dryas,' *Il.* 1. 263, and so takes the Dryopians back into Thessaly, seeing in the geographical order of the Dryopian stations —Styra, Karystos, Kythnos—the links between the Malian and the Argolic gulfs. But geography is not history, and the historic inference from geographical distribution is just the fallacy committed in the Herodotean legend of the Minyai, 4. 145 ff. The Dryopians, like the Minyai, the Dolopians, the Kaukones, the Kekropians, and so on, put us doubtless face to face with the primitive, or all but primitive, population of the Hellenic area. *ἐπῴκησαν δὲ καὶ Ἑρμιόνα ὕστερον Δωριεῖς οἱ ἐξ Ἄργους* Pausan. 2. 34. 5. The date and circumstances of this *ἐποίκισις* are not given, but it did not obliterate apparently the Dryopian character of the town.

8. **ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέος τε καὶ Μηλιέων.** The story is told by Diodor. 4. 37, and by the *Mythographi*; e.g. Apollodoros 2. 7. 7; *Appendix Narrationum*, 28. 6, ed. Westermann (1843). Cp. also Pausan. 4. 35. 6 (for a version told by the Asinaians, cp. c. 73 *infra*). For the connexion of Herakles with Malis cp. 7. 176, 216 *supra*.

44. 2. **ἐκ τῆς ἔξω ἠπείρου**: not merely have the Peloponnesians precedence in this navy-list, but the remainder are enumerated from a Peloponnesian standpoint; contrast the list for Artemision c. 1 *supra*.

3. **Ἀθηναῖοι μέν**: to this *μέν* may correspond the *δέ* in c. 45 *infra*, *Μεγαρέες δέ κτλ.*, but it looks somewhat 'pendent.' A kind of contrast is supplied by the case of the Plataians, but without a *δέ*, its place, perhaps, supplied by *γάρ*; in fact the Plataians are resumed with *οὗτοι μέν νυν*, to which immediately corresponds *Ἀθηναῖοι δέ*. The parenthetical character of the passage, and especially of the learned parenthesis on the *origines* of the Athenians, is manifest, even in the style.

πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους, 'to set against, to compare with all the other peoples.' For this use of *πρός* Blakesley cps. 2. 35 *πρὸς πᾶσαν χώρην*, and 3. 94 *φόρον ἀπαγίνεον πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριηκόσια τάλαντα ψήγματος.*

Hdt. gives the number of the Athenian ships at Salamis as 180. He evidently conceives of the total number available as 200, 20 being manned by the men of Chalkis, cc. 1, 14 *supra*. The anonymous Athenian *ap.* Thuc. 1. 74. 1 claims a little less than two-thirds of 400—which might be about 250. Cp. 7. 144 *supra*.

4. **μοῦνοι**: by themselves alone, i.e. without the Plataians, as the next sentence explains. There was evidently a problem: why were the Plataians, who had assisted to man the Athenian squadron at Artemision (c. 1 *supra*), absent from Salamis? The reason appears to be somewhat conjectural (**διὰ τοιόνδε τι πρῆγμα**). They had landed opposite Chalkis in order to remove their households. The fact of the debarkation is plainly indubitable; the reason for the act is more doubtful. It implies that the complete evacuation of Plataia, and therefore of Attica, had already been resolved on. In the light of c. 40 *supra* it is possible that the Plataians landed in Boiotia expecting to find the Peloponnesian army ready to cover and defend Plataia: they would naturally elect, and indeed be bound, to join the land-forces under such circumstances. The removal was then necessitated by the non-appearance of the Greek army. But had the Plataians been especially eager for further service at sea, they surely might have found a way of rejoining the Athenians at Salamis. Had the evacuation of Attica been already decided on when the Athenians and Plataians parted at Chalkis, surely

μάχησαν Πλαταιέες Ἀθηναίοισι διὰ τοιόνδε τι πρῆγμα· ἀπαλλασσομένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου, ὡς ἐγίνοντο κατὰ Χαλκίδα, οἱ Πλαταιέες ἀποβάντες ἐς τὴν περαίην τῆς Βοιωτίης χώρην πρὸς ἐκκομιδὴν ἐτράποντο τῶν οἰκετέων. οὗτοι μέν νυν τούτους σῴζοντες ἐλείφθησαν. Ἀθη-

---

5 *τι* om. **a** 8 *πτερίην* **B**: *πιερίην* V, Valla ‖ *χώρην* Stein[3]: *χώρης* ‖ *κομιδὴν* **B** 9 *σῴζοντες* van H., Stein[3]: *σώζοντες*

Salamis would have been given as the rendezvous. The Plataians did not perhaps escape some censure at Athens; there is some trace of an apologetic note in this passage. Athenian tradition had its revenge: this *μοῦνοι* became so emphatic that it was sometimes forgotten that the Plataians had fought at Marathon! Cp. 9. 27.

7. **τὴν περαίην τῆς Βοιωτίης χώρην**, "the Boeotian territory on the opposite shore," Blakesley; "the opposite shore of Boeotia," Rawlinson, Macaulay (sc. *χώρης*). The meaning is clear, though the more usual sense would be "the coast opposite Boiotia." The 'Peraia' is looked at from Chalkis, not from Boiotia. Cp. App. Crit.

8. **τῶν οἰκετέων** must surely include 'wives and children' as in c. 106 *infra* *κομίσας τοὺς οἰκέτας*, at once followed by *κομίσαι τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα*, or c. 142 *infra* *γυναῖκάς τε καὶ τὰ ἐς πόλεμον ἄχρηστα οἰκετέων ἐχόμενα πάντα*, where it includes *τέκνα*. Cp. *παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας* c. 40 *supra* (where *οἰκέται* are not specified), *τέκνα τε καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας* c. 41, where *γυναῖκας* must be included. Add *τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκες* cc. 36, 60. The use of *οἰκέτης* as a domestic slave is perhaps something of a euphemism, or meiosis; cp. 7. 170. With **ἐλείφθησαν** cp. 7. 153 *οὐκ ἐλείφθη*.

9. **Ἀθηναῖοι δέ**: as the text now stands this phrase is antithetical to **οὗτοι μέν**, but there is no true antithesis in the argument. This parenthesis on the Attic *origines* can hardly have been intended in the first instance for an Attic public, and may very well be an insertion (belonging to the second draft); in which case *Μεγαρέες δέ* would follow on *οὗτοι μὲν . . ἐλείφθησαν*. But in that case too the antithesis is hardly correct. Perhaps the original text ran *Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν πρὸς πάντας . . ἑκατόν, Μεγαρέες δέ κτλ.*, and the double parenthesis may all be later insertion, and even perhaps not all of the same date and draft (the Attic origins being of the second, the note on the Plataian desertion of Athens of the third hand, or draft, that revision which took place at Athens after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, what time the case of Plataia was doubtless freely and frequently canvassed; cp. Introduction, § 9).

The epitome which follows is the quintessence of primitive Attic history. Hdt. has taken it from some predecessor (possibly Hekataios), though there were perhaps already native *Ἀτθιδογράφοι* at work, cp. 6. 137. But this passage is hardly of strict Attic provenience, nor does it represent the orthodox Athenian tradition or theory. An Athenian would not have admitted Pelasgianism, nor allowed *Κέκροψ* a merely secondary place, nor described Ion as *στρατάρχης* (but rather as *πολέμαρχος*) of Athens. In this passage, as in 1. 57, the Athenians are Pelasgians, virtually from first to last, for the changes they have undergone are merely, or mainly, nominal—a change of names; but Hdt. does not here go so far as to assert that they had changed their language too, or that time was when the Athenians, yea the Ionians, spake a non-Hellenic tongue. The early history of Attica, or at least of Athens, is resumed in four stages, of which the Ionian (with the Ionian tribes, and so forth) was but the last, and imposed *ab extra*. Before there were Ionians there had been Athenians; the Athenian is older than the Ionian name—in Attica. But the names of Kekrops and Kekropidai are older still than the Athenian. So far back the stages, the epochs, are marked by proper names, Ion, Erechtheus, Kekrops. Before Kekrops there is a dim Pelasgian prime, and the forbears of the Athenian people, seemingly one tribe or section of the Pelasgian stock, were hight Kranaoi. But here it is the difference rather than the identity between Athenian and Pelasgian that is emphasized.

ναῖοι δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν Πελασγῶν ἐχόντων τὴν νῦν Ἑλλάδα καλεομένην ἦσαν Πελασγοί, ὀνομαζόμενοι Κραναοί, ἐπὶ δὲ Κέκροπος

---

11 *οὐνομαζόμενοι* **B**

---

10. **ἐπὶ μὲν Πελασγῶν ἐχόντων τὴν νῦν Ἑλλάδα.** Hdt., so far as he has one single consistent view on the 'Pelasgian question,' regards the Pelasgoi as the fore-Hellenic and non-Hellenic population of all the continuous area afterwards invaded and occupied by the Hellenes, and so hellenized. Thus (i.) he places Pelasgoi in Peloponnese (1. 146, 2. 171, 7. 94): in Attica (1. 56, 2. 51, 4. 145, 6. 137): N. Greece (2. 52, 56): in the Islands (2. 51, 4. 145, 5. 26, 6. 136, 140): Asia Minor (7. 42, 95); (ii.) he makes Pelasgia the older name of the Hellenic peninsula (2. 56); (iii.) he believes that the Pelasgoi spake a non-Hellenic language (1. 57). On this view many or most of the early tribal names are subdivisions of the Pelasgic stock: *Αἰγιαλέες Πελασγοί* (7. 94), *Κραναοί Πελασγοί*, and so forth; the Dorians become the Hellenes *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and the area occupied by Hellenic or hellenized tribes in the historic period has, *ex hypothesi*, been occupied in the prehistoric by non-Hellenic tribes, exterminated or absorbed and hellenized by the invaders, leaving only a few isolated survivals here and there (1. 57). But the case of Athens, where there was no record of a Dorian conquest, is a difficulty on this theory, though Herodotus, the Dorian, nevertheless, or perhaps for that very reason, represents the Athenians as Pelasgic, without ever explaining their adoption of Hellenism. Thucydides, the Athenian, represents an opposite, or at least a corrective and rival view. He nowhere commits himself to the doctrine of the non-Hellenic character of the Pelasgoi, or the non-Hellenic character of their language. Hellene and Pelasgian are not with him alternative or exclusive terms at any period; the distinction is merely nominal and verbal. The Pelasgic is indeed older than the Hellenic, but the Pelasgoi are but one, the most considerable, of many tribes inhabiting the potentially Hellenic area (1. 3). The Hellenic name is a matter of fashion, culture, exchange, adoption. The exact relation of Athens to the Pelasgoi is not clear. It is possible that Thucydides did not connect *τὸ Πελαργικόν* (2. 17) with the Pelasgoi; but if the words *καὶ Ἀθήνας* in 4. 109. 4 are authentic (to me they have the air of a gloss), Thucydides admitted *Πελασγοὶ Τυρσηνοί* as quondam inhabitants (*οἰκησάντων*) of Athens: an excursion into the rival hypothesis! In any case he will hardly have regarded the Athenians as Pelasgoi in his own time, much less allowed the Dorian claim to the flower of 'Hellenism.'

Hdt.'s theory in this passage may be diagrammatically exhibited:

Ἀθηναῖοι	i.	ἦσαν	Πελασγοί	<ἀπ' ἀρχῆς>	Πελασγῶν ἐχόντων
		ὠνομάσθησαν	Κραναοί	ἐπὶ Πελασγῶν	τὴν νῦν Ἑλλάδα καλεομένην
	ii.	ἐπεκλήθησαν	Κεκροπίδαι	ἐπὶ Κέκροπος	βασιλέος
	iii.	μετωνομάσθησαν	Ἀθηναῖοι	ἐπ' Ἐρεχθέος	ἐκδεξαμένου τὴν ἀρχήν
	iv.	ἐκλήθησαν	Ἴωνες	ἐπ' Ἴωνος	στρατάρχεω γενομένου Ἀθηναίοισι

11. **Κραναοί.** Hdt. knows nothing apparently of the king or hero Kranaos, who is mentioned by Aischylos (*παῖδες Κραναοῦ Eumen.* 1011 = Athenians), and whose monument (*μνῆμα*) was to be seen, in the time of Pausanias (1. 31. 3), in the deme of Lamptrai; yet, on the other hand, he seems to anticipate the later traditions (i.e. theories) in denying the primacy of Kekrops. *κρα-ναός* may be rightly etymologized (*καρ-*, *κρα-*, and *ναίειν*) as the Dwellers-on-high (Stein: the antithesis to the *Δα-ναοί* = *Ἀργεῖοι* 'dwellers below, on the plain' looks daring, though attractive). Aristophanes has *Κραναὰ πόλις Ach.* 75 for Athens; cp. *Birds* 123 (*τῶν Κραναῶν πόλιν*) and (more specifically for the Akropolis?) *Lys.* 481 (*μεγαλόπετρον ἄβατον*). But Pindar has the word as an epithet not merely of Athens (*Nem.* 8. 11, *Ol.* 7. 82, 13. 38) but of Delos, *Isth.* 1. 4, and with Homer it is the standing epithet of Ithaca (*Il.* 3. 201, *Od.* 1. 247). The primitive meaning would seem to be rather 'hard' than 'head' or 'high.'

βασιλέος ἐκλήθησαν Κεκροπίδαι, ἐκδεξαμένου δὲ Ἐρεχθέος τὴν ἀρχὴν Ἀθηναῖοι μετωνομάσθησαν, Ἴωνος δὲ τοῦ Ξούθου

12 βασιλέως C: βασιλῆος z || ἐπεκλήθησαν **B**z, Holder, van H. || ἐρεχθέως **B** 13 Ἀθηναῖοι: Ἐρεχθηίδαι coni. Krueger

The word is, however, also found as a proper name already in Homer, *Il.* 3. 445, of an island, variously identified (but in no case Ithaca !); cp. Pausan. 3. 22. 1. Perhaps the names Κράνιοι Thuc. 2. 30. 2 etc., Κραννώνιοι 2. 22. 3 may be traced to the same root. Cp. also next note.

Κέκροπος βασιλέος: for Thucydides, at least, Kekrops is apparently the first king in the land, 2. 15. 1, and the only one named by him previous to Theseus, though others are implied. Hdt. here adds Erechtheus, and in 1. 173 supplies the names of Pandion and Aigeus. Whether these four names would have comprised for Hdt. the complete list of Attic, or even of Athenian, kings before Theseus it is not easy to determine. As pointed out in the previous note, Kekrops can hardly be the first king for Hdt. What exact date he would have assigned to Kekrops must also remain an open question; but here at least the period of the Kekropidai is post-Pelasgian and prae-Ionian, nay, even prae-Athenian !

'Kranaos' appears to be an epithet localized, and then converted into a tribe-name and a tribe-ancestor. The eponym has here been generated from the epithet. Is the case to some extent similar with 'Kekrops'? The etymology and meaning of Kekrops are, indeed, obscure. G. Curtius connected the word with καρπ-, fruit, fruitful (vid. L. & S.), in which case the Κέκροπες, Κεκρόπιοι, κεκροπίδαι—terms all used = Ἀθηναῖοι—would be the πέδιοι, or πεδιαῖοι, under another aspect (and contrast well with the κραναοί as above explained). But is not κέκροψ a variant of κέρκοψ, κέρκωψ, the beast, or man, with the tail? (cp. 7. 216 *supra*). It was under such a form that Kekrops was found and worshipped on the Akropolis; and the serpentine image was, or became, symbolical of the autochthonous claim; cp. c. 41 *supra*. Apollod. 3. 14. 1 probably gives the orthodox Attic theory: Κέκροψ αὐτόχθων, συμφυὲς ἔχων σῶμα ἀνδρὸς καὶ δράκοντος, τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐβασίλευσε πρῶτος (except that the unification, the *synoikism*, of the land should be left for Theseus).

12. **Ἐρεχθέος**: of the true essence of Erechtheus there need be comparatively little doubt; he is one with Poseidon (cp. c. 55 *infra*), although, of course, tradition, i.e. early speculation, divided them, and then multiplied Erechtheus by two, or more, into Erechtheus, Erichthonios, in order the better to harmonize discrepant legends. Etymologically he is 'the Render' (cp. ἐρέχθω, Ποσειδῶν ἐρεχθεύς = ἐννοσίγαιος (?), though the connexion with χθών even in Erichthonios is pseudetymology). Like Kekrops, with whom he was sometimes, reasonably enough, identified (cp. Eustath. p. 283, *ap.* Clinton, *Fasti*, i. (1834) p. 62a), Erechtheus is in Attic legend αὐτοχθών. But his divinity is even more incontestable, and he had his temple on the Akropolis, in close association with Athene; cp. above all Homer, *Il.* 2. 547. This close association accounts for the *metonomasia* from Κεκροπίδαι to Ἀθηναῖοι here associated with his régime; not but what Ἐρεχθεῖδαι is found in the poets as an equivalent, Pindar, *Isth.* 2. 19, cp. *Pyth.* 7. 10; Sophokles, *Antig.* 969, *Aj.* 201, etc. etc. Yet it is perhaps a pity that Hdt. did not complete his schematic history of Athenian titles by employing the term; so would he have had 'Athenians' all through as the common element underlying Pelasgians, Kranaians, Kekropids, Erechtheids, Ionians ! Cp. App. Crit.

13. **Ἴωνος δὲ τοῦ Ξούθου.** The conventional pedigree of the sons of Hellen, for which our oldest authority is the Boiotian Hesiod (*Frag.* 25 = Rzach 7), is everywhere presupposed in Hdt., even though the Hellenic character of the Ionians is thus guaranteed, in conflict with his theory (1. 56) of their Pelasgic descent. The insertion of Xuthos does, however, put Ion (and Achaios) one step further from Hellen than Doros (and Aiolos); unless, indeed, with Euripides we make Doros also a son of Xuthos. In Attica Ion (and the Ionians) are immigrant, not autochthonous (though Euripides places his birth in one of the holy caves under the Akropolis), and no Attic tradition gave Ion a place in the suc-

στρατάρχεω γενομένου Ἀθηναίοισι ἐκλήθησαν ἀπὸ τούτου
45 Ἴωνες. Μεγαρέες δὲ τὠυτὸ πλήρωμα παρείχοντο καὶ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ, Ἀμπρακιῶται δὲ ἑπτὰ νέας ἔχοντες ἐπεβοήθησαν, Λευκάδιοι δὲ τρεῖς, ἔθνος ἐόντες οὗτοι Δωρικὸν ἀπὸ

---

14 ἀπὸ: ἐπὶ? van H. 45. 1 παρείχοντο SV Marcianus: παρεῖχον τὸ **α** C: παρείχοντο τὸ PRz 2 νῆας **β** || ἐπεβωήθησαν R: ἐπεβώθησαν SV, Gaisford, van H.

---

cession of kings, though he is recognized here (as in Ἀθην. πολ. *l.c. infra*) as war-leader, war-lord. Was there never an Ionian conquest of or in Attica? The Ionian elements in Attica seem closely welded with the native, and yet distinct (the analogy of Great Britain, with its Saxons and Britons, is perhaps admissible). In Attica, however, the Ionian can hardly have been the aboriginal element, and the 'Athenian' the immigrant; albeit such complete inversions of the truth, such *hystera protera*, are found in Greek legend (cp. 4. 145). One thing is clear: there was no 'Norman,' no Dorian conquest of Attica (cp. 5. 76 and my notes); and the settlement of population in Attica went back to a much more primitive date than in Peloponnese, or in the rest of Central Greece; hence the relative continuity of Attic history and culture, the priority and scale of the 'Theseian' synoikism.

14. **στρατάρχεω**: elsewhere Ion had been perhaps a king (cp. Pausan. 7. 1. 5 *ἐπὶ τῆς Ἴωνος βασιλείας κτλ.*), though Hdt. does not expressly say so in 7. 94. The 'Aristotelian' theory traced the origin of the *πολεμαρχία*, as distinct from the *βασιλεία*, to the appointment of Ion: *δεύτερα δὲ ἐπικατέστη πολεμαρχία, διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τινὰς τῶν βασιλέων τὰ πολέμια μαλακούς, ὅθεν καὶ τὸν Ἴωνα μετεπέμψαντο χρείας καταλαβούσης*, *Ath. Pol.* c. 3. (The need was the war with Eumolpos of Eleusis.) Something very like this theory, this story, is already implied in Hdt. Strabo 383 possibly preserves the 'Aristotelian' version: *Ἴων δὲ τοὺς μετ' Εὐμόλπου νικήσας Θρᾷκας οὕτως ηὐδοκίμησεν ὥστ' ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ τὴν πολιτείαν. ὁ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν εἰς τέτταρας φυλὰς διεῖλε τὸ πλῆθος εἶτα εἰς τέτταρας βίους· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ γεωργοὺς ἀπέδειξε τοὺς δὲ δημιουργοὺς τοὺς δὲ ἱεροποιοὺς τετάρτους δὲ τοὺς φύλακας· τοιαῦτα δὲ πλείω διατάξας τὴν χώραν ἐπώνυμον ἑαυτοῦ κατέλιπεν.* This looks like the *πρώτη μετάστασις τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, the *κατάστασις Ἴωνος καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ συνοικισάντων* (or *συνοικησάντων* Blass)· *τότε γὰρ πρῶτον εἰς τὰς τέτταρας συνενεμήθησαν φυλάς, καὶ τοὺς φυλοβασιλέας κατέστησαν*, c. 41. 2. Ion, on that showing, is war-lord and legislator, though not strictly 'king.' The four *βίοι ap.* Strabon. are, of course, a rationalization of the tribal names, as in 5. 66 *supra*; cp. notes *ad l.c.* The tomb of Ion was to be seen, in Pausanias' time, at Potamoi, Pausan. 1. 31. 3 (*n.b. ἐπολεμάρχησε*), 7. 1. 5.

45. 1. **Μεγαρέες**, like the Korinthians, add nothing to their Artemisian contingent (20), and the same formula is applied; cp. c. 43 *supra*. That they were Dorian 'goes without saying'; unless, indeed, the concluding words of the chapter be taken to cover the case of Megara, and to make it a Korinthian colony. This view would scarcely agree with 5. 76 *supra*, where the Dorian settlement of Megara is expressly recorded. Cp. Busolt i.[2] (1893) 220, who omits any reference to this passage, rightly enough. The later tradition that the Korinthians were especially concerned in the Dorization of Megara hardly accords, as Busolt points out, with the silence of Thucydides (i.e. the Korinthians *ap.* Thuc.), or with the cult of Hera Akraia, in Megara and in Byzantion, its colony.

2. **Ἀμπρακιῶται**: for the geographical position of Ambrakia cp. c. 47 *infra*. Ἀμπρακία is the older form of the name: cp. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien*, 25, etc. Their contingent of 7 is a clear addition to the Artemision list. Ambrakia is expressly described as a colony from Korinth by Thuc. 2. 80. 3, and was plainly a loyal colony. For the coinage cp. B. Head, *Historia Numorum*, 270—none of the many extant varieties (all of Korinthian type) going back before the fourth century. The Ambrakiotes probably came to Pogon and Salamis out of loyalty to Korinth and at her summons (**ἐπεβοήθησαν**).

3. **Λευκάδιοι**: for the geographical

Κορίνθου. νησιωτέων δὲ Αἰγινῆται τριήκοντα παρείχοντο. **46**
ἦσαν μέν σφι καὶ ἄλλαι πεπληρωμέναι νέες, ἀλλὰ τῇσι μὲν τὴν ἑωυτῶν ἐφύλασσον, τριήκοντα δὲ τῇσι ἄριστα πλεούσῃσι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ἐναυμάχησαν. Αἰγινῆται δὲ εἰσὶ Δωριέες ἀπὸ

---

46. 2 ἔσαν z ‖ μέν νυν **β** ‖ ἄλλαι <ι′ = δέκα> Cobet: ἄλλαι <δυοκαίδεκα> van H. ‖ νῆες **β** : νέες δυοκαίδεκα ? Stein 3 πλωούσησι (-ϊν V) **β** : πλωούσῃσι Palm, van H.

---

position of Leukas cp. c. 47 *infra*. The Leukadian contingent of 3 is a clear addition to the navy-list. Leukas was a Korinthian colony (Thuc. 1. 30. 2), and, like Ambrakia, a loyal colony. Its coinage, of the Korinthian type and standard, reaches back into the fifth century B.C., Head p. 279.

οὗτοι. It is not quite clear whether Hdt. means this word, and the statement which follows, to apply to the Leukadians only, or to Ambrakiotes and Leukadians, or to Megarians, Ambrakiotes, and Leukadians, all three. *Prima facie* it applies to the Leukadians alone. Historically it would be equally true of the Ambrakiotes. Its application to the Megarians would be at least highly questionable in a historic sense; see above.

46. 1. **νησιωτέων**: the third geographical division: without the article cp. 7. 95. There follow the names and numbers of ten contingents, from eight islands, Aigina, Euboia, Keos, Naxos, Kythnos, Seriphos, Siphnos, Melos, three separate contingents being drawn from Euboia. It is not clear on what principle the order is determined.

Αἰγινῆται, as furnishing the largest contingent, perhaps as having afterwards won the *ἀριστεῖα*, and as Dorians, have the first place. The contingent of 30 here recorded for Salamis exceeds the Artemisian contingent by 12; whether it includes the ships present at Artemision is not made clear. The statement is that the 30 ships at Salamis did not include all the Aiginetan ships actually in commission (**πεπληρωμέναι**, the *πλήρωμα* in this case being the *Mannschaft*; cp. c. 43 *supra*). The **ἄλλαι νέες** may have comprised all, or some, of the Artemisian contingent of 18, which, after the engagements off Euboia, might no longer be reckoned to *τῇσι ἄριστα πλεούσῃσι*. So the total of the Aiginetan vessels in commission might be raised to 48, and yet fall short of the fleet with which they had fought Athens between 487–482 B.C., cp. 6. 92, 93 (which can hardly have numbered less than 50). There is something amiss with the numbering of the Aiginetan fleets. Below, c. 48, Hdt. gives the total figure for the fleet at Salamis as 378, while his items only supply a sum 366. Are the missing 12 to be added to the 30 Aiginetans so as to bring the actual contingent present at Salamis to 42? If so, how did the figure 30 arise? Or are the 12 to be inserted here as the figure for the *ἄλλαι* (cp. App. Crit.)? But, if so, they should not be reckoned in the Salaminian total *infra*, for they were not at Salamis; moreover, Pausanias 2. 29. 5, rightly or wrongly, makes the Aiginetans second only to the Athenians in the number of their fleet (*ἐν τῷ Μηδικῷ πολέμῳ παρασχέσθαι πλοῖα μετά γε Ἀθηναίους πλεῖστα*), yet the figure above given for the Korinthian squadron was 40. The figures 30, 18, 12 all come into the reckoning, and all stand in a definite relation to one another: did the Aiginetan fleet in 480 B.C. number less than 60 vessels, of which 42 were present at the battle of Salamis, only 30 being reckoned (*αἱ*) *ἄριστα πλέουσαι*, while with 18—possibly those previously at Artemision—*τὴν ἑωυτῶν ἐφύλασσον*—they were on guard off Aigina?

4. **εἰσὶ Δωριέες ἀπὸ Ἐπιδαύρου**: at the time when Hdt. wrote these words surely the Aiginetans were still in their own island home, and not outcasts in Kynuria, Thuc. 2. 27 (much less victims of extreme Athenian vengeance, Thuc. 4. 57); in other words, this passage is of older composition than 6. 91 *supra*. Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8. This note on the origin of the Aiginetans—Dorians from Epidauros—also seems written quite independently of the story in 5. 83, where the early dependence of Aigina

Ἐπιδαύρου· τῇ δὲ νήσῳ πρότερον οὔνομα ἦν Οἰνώνη. μετὰ δὲ Αἰγινήτας Χαλκιδέες τὰς ἐπ᾽ Ἀρτεμισίῳ εἴκοσι παρεχόμενοι καὶ Ἐρετριέες τὰς ἑπτά· οὗτοι δὲ Ἴωνες εἰσί. μετὰ

---

upon Epidauros is described, though without any express recognition of the 'metropolitan' character of Epidauros—a contrast at least compatible with the hypothesis that this note is of earlier composition. That Aigina was a Dorian island in the historic period is indubitable; e.g. the not very numerous tituli Aeginetici, Cauer, *Delectus*[2] No. 65–70, E. S. Roberts, *Gk. Epigraphy* i. (1887) §§ 57–59, and the uniform literary and historical evidences from Pindar to Pausanias. The date and circumstances of its occupation by the Dorians, and the precise starting-point of the colonists, are items of doubtful tradition and speculation. Hdt. here traces the Dorian colonists no further back than Epidauros; in 1. 146 he mixes up Dorians of Epidauros with the Ionian migration to Asia Minor; the Dorization of Epidauros itself he does not record. Pausanias 2. 29. 5 supplies a text: *μοῖρα Ἀργείων τῶν Ἐπίδαυρον ὁμοῦ Δηϊφόντῃ κατασχόντων διέβη ἐς Αἴγιναν*. The Dorians of Aigina ultimately hailed from Dorian Argos; and so more expressly Aigina was sometimes made a colony of Argos: *Τριάκων τις Ἀργεῖος συλλέξας πλῆθος Ἀργείων, οἱ δὲ Ἀργεῖοι τοῦ Δωρικοῦ γένους, εἰς τὴν Αἴγιναν ἦλθε καὶ κατῴκησε* Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 8. 39. Epidauros was perhaps no more than the port of departure; and notwithstanding the air of antiquity lent to the traditions, we may reasonably doubt whether the Dorization of Aigina was much more ancient than the age of Pheidon, or the dependence of Aigina on Epidauros (5. 83) more than a misconception of the relations of the island to the Argive power under the last of the Temenid kings of Argolis.

5. **τῇ δὲ νήσῳ . . Οἰνώνη.** The statement would suggest that the name *Αἴγινα* was of Dorian coinage; but it belongs to a class of names (beginning with *Αἰγ-*) that go back long before the coming of the Dorians, and Aigina was the name of the island apparently in the days of the Kalaurian Amphiktyony. So, too, the tradition that Zeus carried the nymph Aigina to the desert island Oinone, where she became mother of the first inhabitant Aiakos (Pausan. 2. 29. 2), pushes the proper name back as far as the earliest population. The form of the name given by Pindar *Isth.* 7. 23 (telling the same story) is *Οἰνοπία* (*σὲ δ᾽ ἐς νᾶσον Οἰνοπίαν φέρων ἐκοιμᾶτο κτλ.*), but elsewhere he has *Οἰνώνα* (*Nem.* 4. 46, 5. 15, 8. 7, *Isth.* 4. (5.) 35). Is the supposed ancient 'name' of the island much more than an epithet deranged? As in the parallel cases of *Καλλίστη Θήρα* (4. 147), or *Σχερία* = *Κόρκυρα* (Pausan. 2. 5. 2), the supposed original is more indubitably Greek, or at least more transparently significant, than the name of supposed later origin—a point fatal to the asserted priority. 'Oinone,' too, is known as a nymph, the bride of Paris (Apollod. 3. 12. 6 *et al.*); and the syllable *οἰν-* is as common, but is it also as ancient, as *αἰγ-* in the composition of proper names? The name Oinone might be connected with the frequent *Οἰνόη* (*bis* in Attica, *ter* in Peloponnese, and elsewhere; e.g. Ikaria, Steph. B.), *Οἰνοῦς*, *Οἰνοῦσσαι*, *Οἰνεών* (*Οἰνόανδα*), and others—all genuine place-names, of indubitably vinous associations. Cp. Grassberger, *Gr. Ortsnamen*, p. 227. This nomenclature looks Indo-European: can it be primitive *in loco*?

6. **Χαλκιδέες** furnish 20 vessels to the Salaminian navy-list, and these expressly the same ships as at Artemision; but the list here leaves us to find out for ourselves by back reference that the ships, though manned by the men of Chalkis, were really supplied by Athens (c. 1 *supra*); in fact it might more accurately have been said of the Chalkidians, *τὠυτὸ πλήρωμα παρείχοντο*. The observation confirms the suspicion that Hdt. is here drawing on a different source.

7. **Ἐρετριέες** supply 'the seven,' i.e. the same as before, at Artemision; but these were really their own. The **οὗτοι** here refers to the Eretrians, who, though Ionians, are not *ἀπὸ Ἀθηνέων*. It might conceivably refer to both Chalkidians and Eretrians, but *συναμφότεροι οὗτοι* would then have been clearer; see below. The 'Chalkidians' are presumably Athenian kleruchs, even though the crews in the 20 vessels may have been natives. Cp. c. 1 *supra*.

δὲ Κήιοι τὰς αὐτὰς παρεχόμενοι, ἔθνος ἐὸν Ἰωνικὸν ἀπὸ Ἀθηνέων. Νάξιοι δὲ παρείχοντο τέσσερας, ἀποπεμφθέντες μὲν ἐς τοὺς Μήδους ὑπὸ τῶν πολιητέων κατά περ οἱ ἄλλοι νησιῶται, ἀλογήσαντες δὲ τῶν ἐντολέων ἀπίκατο ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας Δημοκρίτου σπεύσαντος, ἀνδρὸς τῶν ἀστῶν δοκίμου

---

8 *κεῖοι* **a**CP, Palm, van H. : *κῖοι* **B**z || *ἐὸν* om. **B** 9 *ἀθηναίων* B**B**, Stein[1] 10 *ὦλλοι* **B** : *ὦλλοι* Schaefer, Gaisford, Holder, van H. 11 *ἀπίκοντο* **B** 12 *πλεύσαντος* **B**

---

8. **Κήιοι** supply 'the same' ships as at Artemision, 2 in number; their Atheno-Ionian origin is expressly specified. The island of Keos is nowhere mentioned *nominatim* by Hdt. (cp. c. 76 *infra*), nor does it appear that he ever landed on it; but he had doubtless seen the Κηίων ἱστιητόριον at Delos (4. 35 *supra*), and he was acquainted with the works of the greatest of all Keians, Simonides; cp. 7. 228 *supra*. Athens claimed 'metropolitan' recognition, of course, from the Ionians of the Kyklades as from the Ionians of Asia; cp. 5. 99, 1. 147.

9. **Νάξιοι**: the four Naxian triremes are pure gain; the title refers grammatically to the very men on board, who had been despatched by the Commonwealth to join the enemy, their nominal suzerain, but had taken the law into their own hands, and joined the Greek side. This independent action of the Naxian fleet recalls, *mutatis mutandis*, the action of the Samians despatched by Polykrates to serve under Kambyses in Egypt, 3. 45, and anticipates (in a small way) the separate action of the Athenian fleet at Samos in 412–11 B.C., Thucydides 8. 75 f., not to say that of the Ionians at Byzantion in 477 B.C., Thuc. 1. 95, Plutarch. *Arist.* 23. One might suspect that the Naxian fleet on this occasion was more 'democratic,' more Attic, than οἱ πολιῆται. But see l. 12 below.

10. **ἐς τοὺς Μήδους**: not here, as sometimes, a geographical phrase. The employment of Μῆδος for Πέρσης is not common in these Books, and perhaps belongs to 'the source.'

κατά περ οἱ ἄλλοι νησιῶται: in the Aegean, who, with the exception of Seriphos, Siphnos, Melos, had all given 'earth and water' to 'the barbarian.' Cp. c. 66 below.

11. **ἀπίκατο**: a pluperfect, with the full temporal significance, referring to a past act rather than to a present result; so, the force of the form is different from the construction with the auxiliary verb, as in ἦσαν πεπληρωμέναι νέες l. 2 above.

12. **Δημοκρίτου.** Hdt. may owe the name of Demokritos (a popular name!) to an epigram of Simonides, recognized as authentic by M. Hauvette, *de l'authenticité des Epigrammes de Simonide* (1896) p. 53,

Δημόκριτος τρίτος ἦρξε μάχης ὅτε πὰρ Σαλαμῖνα
Ἕλληνες Μήδοις σύμβαλον ἐν πελάγει·
πέντε δὲ νῆας ἕλεν δηίων, ἕκτην δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς
ῥύσατο βαρβαρικῆς Δωρίδ' ἁλισκομένην,

preserved by Plutarch, *de malig. Hdti.* 36. His τριηραρχία presumably extended to one only of the four triremes. His position would not be inconsistent with his being a democrat. It is remarkable that Hdt. does not supply his father's name, nor does the epigram. There is no sharp opposition intended between **τῶν ἀστῶν** and **τῶν πολιητέων** just above.

On the Athenian origin of the Ionian Naxians cp. l. 8 above. Naxos was and had been a much more important island than Keos, and had been held to Athenian interests in the days of Peisistratos (1. 64). Its rivalry with Miletos at the end of the sixth cent., and party feuds within the island itself, had led indirectly to the conflict between the Ionians and Persia in which Athens had become involved (5. 28, 31); and though Naxos had escaped the first assault upon its liberties from the Asiatic side (5. 33), it had succumbed—with the rest—to Datis and Artaphrenes (6. 95 f.) in 490 B.C. For the decade previous to Salamis its history is a blank; but evidently Naxos had resigned neither its ambitions nor its party feuds.

καὶ τότε τριηραρχέοντος. Νάξιοι δὲ εἰσὶ Ἴωνες ἀπὸ Ἀθηνέων γεγονότες. Στυρέες δὲ τὰς αὐτὰς παρείχοντο νέας τάς περ ἐπ᾽ Ἀρτεμισίῳ, Κύθνιοι δὲ μίαν καὶ πεντηκόντερον, ἐόντες συναμφότεροι οὗτοι Δρύοπες. καὶ Σερίφιοι δὲ καὶ Σίφνιοι καὶ Μήλιοι ἐστρατεύοντο· οὗτοι γὰρ οὐκ ἔδοσαν μοῦνοι
47 *νησιωτέων τῷ βαρβάρῳ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ. οὗτοι μὲν ἅπαντες ἐντὸς οἰκημένοι Θεσπρωτῶν καὶ Ἀχέροντος ποταμοῦ ἐστρατεύοντο· Θεσπρωτοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ ὁμουρέοντες Ἀμπρακιώτῃσι καὶ*

---

13 *ἀπ᾽* **B**, Holder, van H. 14 *γεγονότες* secl. Kallenberg || *νῆας* **B** || *τάς περ*: *τὰς καὶ* **B**, Holder 15 *Κύθνιοι* Wesseling: *κύνθιοι* A**B**z: *κίνθιοι* BC, Marc. 16 *δὲ* Stein[3]: *τε* (*πρὸς δὲ τούτοισι καὶ Σερίφιοι*? Stein[2]) || *σίφνιοί τε* **B** **47.** 1 *πάντες* **B** 3 *γάρ εἰσι* Stein[1] || *οἱ ὁμουρέοντες* **B**z

---

14. **Στυρέες.** Styra, in Euboia, sends the same ships as to Artemision, two in number. The Styrians are 'Dryopians'; cp. c. 43 *supra.*

15. **Κύθνιοι.** Kythnos, a small island due south of Keos, had been unrepresented at Artemision; its modest contingent, one trireme and one 'pentekonter,' is hardly equivalent to its later, and apparently fixed, tribute to Athens of 3 talents, an amount doubled by the *τάξις* of 425 B.C.

16. **συναμφότεροι** clears **οὗτοι.**

Σερίφιοι. Seriphos, due south of Kythnos, appears for the first time, and with but one pentekonter; c. 48 *infra.* (It paid Athens afterwards 2 – 1 talents tribute—the figure for 425 B.C. unfortunately irrecoverable.) Athens counts as its metropolis, *ib.*

Σίφνιοι. Siphnos, SE. of Seriphos, was a well-to-do island (cp. 3. 57 f.), and afterwards paid 3 talents' tribute to Athens, a sum trebled by the *τάξις* of 425 B.C. Yet it likewise contributes but one pentekonter to the fleet, c. 48 *infra.* The population is indistinguishable from that of Seriphos, *ib.*

17. **Μήλιοι.** Melos, SW. of Siphnos, a larger island, and still better known to fame, but not properly belonging to the Kyklades (cp. c. 48 *infra*), furnished two pentekonters, c. 48 *infra.* In 425 B.C. the Athenians assessed Melos at 15 talents (vid. *τάξις φόρου*, Hicks's *Manual*,[2] No. 64); but this was probably a mere excuse for the conquest and destruction of the island, which was accomplished in 416 B.C., Thucyd. 5. 84–116 (unless, indeed, it was meant to recoup the Athenians for the failure of the previous expedition in the year before the *τάξις*, Thuc. 3. 91). The days of greatest wealth for Melos were in that primitive period when its beds of obsidian supplied one of the most valuable staples of the stone age (cp. *Annual of Br. School at Athens*, Nos. iii., iv., v.); but the fame of the island in modern times is more intimately associated with the marble now standing in the Louvre and known as the 'Venus of Milo.'

οὗτοι: there is again, and for the third time in the list, some ambiguity in the extension of this term, but it may be restricted to *Μήλιοι.*

47 2. **ἐντός**, 'east of' this side: a natural phrase to Hdt. and his eastern sources, but not one that he would have used in this connexion while resident in Italy, or even after familiarity with the further west. *Pro tanto* the phrase makes for the early composition of these Books; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

3. **Θεσπρωτῶν καὶ Ἀχέροντος ποταμοῦ**: the same conjunction in 5. 92 *ἐς Θεσπρωτοὺς ἐπ᾽ Ἀχέροντα ποταμόν*, the seat of a *νεκυομαντήιον.* Thesprotia is given above, 7. 176, as the original home of the Thessalians, and still more precisely in 2. 56 as in the neighbourhood of the oracle of Dodona. The position of Acheron and Thesprotis is still more clearly marked by Thucydides, 1. 46. 3 f. *ἐπειδὴ δὲ προσέμειξαν τῇ κατὰ Κέρκυραν ἠπείρῳ ἀπὸ Λευκάδος πλέοντες, ὁρμίζονται ἐς Χειμέριον τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος γῆς. ἔστι δὲ λιμήν, καὶ πόλις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ κεῖται ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐν τῇ Ἐλαιάτιδι τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος Ἐφύρη. ἐξίησι δὲ παρ᾽ αὐτὴν Ἀχερουσία λίμνη ἐς θάλασσαν· διὰ δὲ τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος Ἀχέρων ποταμὸς ῥέων ἐσβάλλει ἐς*

Λευκαδίοισι, οἳ ἐξ ἐσχατέων χωρέων ἐστρατεύοντο. τῶν δὲ ἐκτὸς τούτων οἰκημένων Κροτωνιῆται μοῦνοι ἦσαν οἳ ἐβοήθησαν τῇ Ἑλλάδι κινδυνευούσῃ μιῇ νηί, τῆς ἦρχε ἀνὴρ τρὶς πυθιονίκης Φάυλλος. Κροτωνιῆται δὲ γένος εἰσὶ Ἀχαιοί. οἱ μέν 48

4 οἳ om. **B** || δ' **a** 5 οἳ ἐβώθησαν **B**, van H.: οἳ ἐβόθησαν V: οἱ βοηθήσαντες z 6 νηὶ μιῇ **B**Pz, Holder, van H. || πυθιόνικος **B** (πυθόνικος R ap. Stein(1)) 7 φάϋλος S Valla: Φαῦλος Eustath. Dion. 308 **48.** 1 μέν νυν B: μὲν cum νυν superscr. A: μὲν **B**

αὐτήν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχει. ῥεῖ δὲ καὶ Θύαμις ποταμός, ὁρίζων τὴν Θεσπρωτίδα καὶ Κεστρίνην, ὧν ἐντὸς ἡ ἄκρα ἀνέχει τὸ Χειμέριον (where, by the way, *ἐντός = μεταξύ*). Cp. Thuc. 1. 30. 3, also 50. 3 *ἔστι δὲ τὰ Σύβοτα τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος λιμὴν ἐρῆμος.*

Hdt.'s description of Thesprotis as bordering on Leukas and Ambrakia is not very precise, and leaves the relative positions of the two great Korinthian colonies in doubt. Here again Thucydides supplies fuller and more accurate topography, both directly and incidentally, e.g. the relation of Leukas to Kephallenia and its position in Akarnania, 2. 30. 2, and narrative *passim*; the site of Ambrakia, on the 'Ambrakian gulf,' 1. 29. 3; and the chorography presented in the account of the campaign round Argos Amphilochicum, 2. 68–114, *passim.*

Hdt.'s references here do not suggest autopsy, or any personal acquaintance with the region. If he ever landed in those parts (as e.g. for a visit to Dodona) it was after this passage had been written, and the passage has been left unrevised: fresh evidence of the relatively early date of the composition of this part of the work.

Acheron must have been notorious as the principal stream of Thesprotis, though by no means so considerable a stream as the Arachthos, on which Ambrakia was situate. What its relation, if any, to the subterranean stream of Homer, *Od.* 10. 513, is an obscure problem (but there was necromancy in the neighbourhood, see above).

5. **Κροτωνιῆται**: this passage on Kroton looks as though it might be an insertion (cp. Introduction, § 9): the one trireme from Italy does not affect the total, which is in any case out of gear. The addition of any one, after naming those *ἐξ ἐσχατέων χωρέων*, is rather clumsy. The absence of any reference in Bk. 7 to an invitation to Kroton further isolates this note. The Krotoniate name does not figure on the *τρικάρηνος ὄφις.* On the other hand, the notice of Phayllos *τρὶς πυθιονίκης* makes it more likely that the service of the Krotoniate trireme at Salamis was definitely commemorated in the east, or the mother-land; and the passage presently quoted from Pausanias makes this conclusion binding. The **μοῦνοι** here excludes not merely all other Italiotes and Sikeliotes, but the Korkyraians to boot; cp. 7. 168.

7. **Φάυλλος**: Phayllos of Kroton was celebrated throughout Hellas for his three victories at Pytho, two in the Pentathlon, one in the foot-race alone. The inference that all three Pythian victories were won previously to his service at Salamis is not binding: it is enough that they were all ancient history to Herodotus. *Φαΰλῳ* (*sic*) *δὲ Κροτωνιάτῃ—Ὀλυμπίασι μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ νίκη, τὰς δὲ Πυθοῖ πεντάθλου δύο ἀνείλετο καὶ σταδίου τὴν τρίτην· ἐναυμάχησε δὲ καὶ ἐναντία τοῦ Μήδου ναῦν τε παρασκευασάμενος οἰκείαν, καὶ Κροτωνιατῶν ὁπόσοι ἐπεδήμουν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀνεβίβασε—τούτου ἐστὶν ἀνδριὰς ἐν Δελφοῖς* Pausan. 10. 9. 2. The inscription on this statue is ultimately at least the source of this notice in Hdt. A Phayllos is mentioned by Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 215, *Wasps* 1206, as a proverbially good runner: the Scholiast calls him an *Ὀλυμπιονίκης*—which, if correct, would forbid identification with the man here in question, for not only does Pausanias expressly guard against it, but Phayllos of Kroton was more distinguished as a 'pentathlete,' and most distinguished for his service at Salamis. The name, a diminutive of *Φάων*, is not uncommon: the most celebrated bearer was undoubtedly the brother of Onomarchos, the Phokian, who plundered Delphi, Pausan. 10. 2. 6 etc. The passage in Pausanias quoted

νυν ἄλλοι τριήρεας παρεχόμενοι ἐστρατεύοντο, Μήλιοι δὲ καὶ Σίφνιοι καὶ Σερίφιοι πεντηκοντέρους· Μήλιοι μὲν γένος ἐόντες

2 παρέχοντες **β** ('perperam' van H.) 3 ἐόντες **β**: γεγονότες **α**

above suggests to Blakesley that Phayllos and his comrades were exiles, and that his participation in the battle of Salamis was a purely private affair. Had the Krotoniate by any chance come to try his fortunes at the 75th Olympiad?

Κροτωνιῆται δὲ γένος εἰσὶ Ἀχαιοί. To Hdt. the prae-Dorian population of the Peloponnesos was mainly or largely 'Achaian' (cp. 5. 72), a theory no doubt in part based upon the Homeric poems. The Achaians of historic Achaia had apparently concentrated in what was previously an Ionian province on the north coast, and expelled the Ionians; cp. 1. 145. From that Peloponnesian Achaia, Achaians had apparently subsequently migrated to southern Italy, and made of it a great or greater Hellas. To the Greeks of the fifth century the Achaians were undoubtedly the most genuine 'Hellenes' at least of earlier or prae-Dorian days, and the prae-Dorian culture, the culture of the Homeric poems, of the heroic age, was in their eyes an Achaian culture. The Achaian name is found actually attached to the soil of historic Hellas in two places, south Thessaly and north Peloponnese, and Achaians are with certainty to be found in Krete, in south Italy, and even as far as Kypros. How that could be, if the Achaians were not Greeks at all, but 'a small Celtic tribe' (Ridgeway, *Early Age of Greece*, i. 1901) merged and lost in the Hellenic mass, is an enigma. Prof. Bury, who in his *History* (1900) appears somewhat to minimize the importance of the Achaians, and even of the Hellenes, in Hellenic culture, nevertheless proved (to my mind) the virtual identity of Hellenes and Achaians originally, and explained thereby the strange origin of the designation of 'Great Greece' for the south of Italy, which could only have been so called in distinction to the lesser Hellas from which the Achaian colonists had come—a mere district of Peloponnese, or it may be of Thessaly; cp. *J.H.S.* xv. (1895) 235 ff.

48. 2. **τριήρεας . . πεντηκοντέρους.** The 'pentekonter' was a war-galley, no doubt open throughout, with 50 oars (25 each side), and probably not less than 100 feet long (120 feet; cp. Torr, *Ancient Ships*, p. 21). Its construction in Greece dated to the beginning of the seventh century if Thuc. 1. 13 is to be trusted (see C. Torr, *op. cit.* p. 4); the Phaiakians, however, in the *Odyssey* (8. 34 ff.) had such a vessel. It was in pentekonters, according to Hdt. 1. 163, that the Phokaians made their long voyages in the west, and that the Theraians crossed to Libya to found Kyrene in 630 B.C.; and in pentekonters, according to Thuc. 1. 13. 6, the Phokaians defeated the Carthaginians off Massalia about 600 B.C. Even the Athenian and Aiginetan navies at the beginning of the fifth century were mainly composed of pentekonters, according to Thuc. 1. 14. 3, and he even declares that most of the vessels in which the Athenians fought at Salamis were not fully decked, *ib.*, a statement which ill accords with the large number of *Epibatai* carried. He does not, however, expressly deny that they were triremes.

Triremes were the rule in 480 B.C., according to Hdt. in this passage. He elsewhere reckons 200 men as the crew, or complement of rowers; cp. 7. 184 *supra*. (The actual number of oars used on the three banks (?) of an Attic trireme was 170 to 174, cp. Torr, *op. cit.* p. 10 f., and there might be thirty in reserve, or supplement; for the precise allocation of the oars cp. *op. cit.*) The trireme was something less than 150 feet long, and less than 20 feet broad (cp. Torr, p. 22)—measurements which may not be quite precise for 480 B.C. Cp. also M. A. Cartault, *La trière Athénienne*, 1881; J. Kopecky, *Die attischen Trieren*, 1890.

3. **Μήλιοι . . γένος ἐόντες ἀπὸ Λακεδαίμονος.** Hdt. says the Melians were from Lakedaimon; he does not expressly say that they were Dorian. Thuc. 5. 84, 2. 89, 106, fully recognizes them as Λακεδαιμονίων ἄποικοι, and seems to give 1116 B.C. as an approximate date for the colonization in c. 112 (416 + 700). Judging by the parallel case of Thera (Hdt. 4. 148), the genuinely 'Dorian' element in the emigration will have been very small; yet, like Thera, Melos used a 'Dorian' alphabet and dialect (cp.

ἀπὸ Λακεδαίμονος δύο παρείχοντο, Σίφνιοι δὲ καὶ Σερίφιοι Ἴωνες ἐόντες ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων μίαν ἑκάτεροι. ἀριθμὸς δὲ ἐγένετο ὁ πᾶς τῶν νεῶν, πάρεξ τῶν πεντηκοντέρων, τριηκόσιαι καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ.

Ὡς δὲ ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα συνῆλθον οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀπὸ **49**

---

5 Ἀθηνέων Stein[2]: *ἀθηναίων* 6 *νηῶν* **B** ‖ *ὀκτὼ καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα* (*πεντήκοντα* V) *καὶ τριηκόσιαι* **B**, Holder, van H. **49.** 1 *στρατηγοὶ* <*οἱ*> van H.

Roberts, *Greek Epigraphy*, §§ 19–23), a fact which no doubt would favour the 'Lakedaimonian' legend.

6. **πάρεξ τῶν πεντηκοντέρων**, of which there were all told seven: two from Keos, two from Melos, and one each from Kythnos, Seriphos, and Siphnos.

τριηκόσιαι καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ. This total is repeated (virtually) and raised to 380 by the addition of the Tenian vessel which joined at Salamis, and the Lemnian vessel which had joined at Artemision, c. 82 *infra*; the total here is therefore certain. Yet it exceeds the items, which amount only to 366, by 12. There is therefore something wrong with the items. Valckenaer would have read 42 for the Aiginetans, c. 46 *supra*; this agrees with the statement of Pausanias that next to the Athenians the Aiginetans supplied most ships. The repetition of the *τριήκοντα* need not bar this emendation; if the figure was once corrupted, it would be corrected in the other case in the light of the corruption. Moreover, this bolder emendation is preferable to the insertion of 12 for the *ἄλλαι νέες*, first because the list is not a list of all the ships in commission, but only of those which fought at Salamis; secondly, because 42 is rather a low figure for the absolute sum of the Aiginetan navy, all told; while if 42 were at Salamis, and 18 in service at home, we get a total of 60 ships in commission, which is a more probable figure for Aigina at this time. If the Aiginetan 30 were to be maintained for Salamis we should have to tinker one or more of the other items. K. O. Mueller, *Aeginetica*, p. 122, suggested reading *Σικυώνιοι δὲ πεντεκαίδεκα παρείχοντο πλεῦνας*, i.e. 12 + 15, raising the Sikyonian contingent from 12 (Artemision) to 27, which is less ingenious than Gutschmid's compromise to raise Troizen from 5 to 7, and the Aiginetans from 30 to 40.

Hdt. evidently finds it necessary to account for the smallness of the Aiginetan contingent by the remark that it was by no means all the ships they had in commission; but Rawlinson, in supposing that they had 40 on guard off their own island, while maintaining 30 at Salamis, seems to go too far; the majority of the Aiginetan navy, like that of every other Greek state, was at Salamis. The variant 358 is quite worthless; cp. App. Crit.

With Hdt.'s total of 378 (or 380) for the Greek navy at Salamis is to be compared Aischylos' 300 (*Pers.* 339), Thucydides' 400 (1. 74. 1), Demosthenes' 300 (*de cor.* 238). If Demosthenes did not find this figure in his copy of Thucydides (Stahl; "ex aliquot deterioribus," Hude) the two historians virtually agree as against the poet and the orator. Ktesias (ed. Gilmore, § 57), from the Persian point of view, makes it 700 (of which apparently only 110 are Athenian). Tzetzes' 271 (*ad Lycoph.* 1432) is surely only a confusion with the numbers given by Hdt. for Artemision.

The phrase repeated **ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ἐναυμάχησαν** suggests that the list is compiled not from documents drawn up for working purposes beforehand, but from memorial lists and commemorative offerings—an inference further supported by the mention of Demokritos and Phayllos.

49. 1. **ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα**: perhaps the town; cp. c. 42 *supra*.

οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀπὸ τ. εἰρ. πολίων: including Kroton, 21 *πόλιες* have been named in the navy-list. It is hardly conceivable that Phayllos, or even Demokritos, was admitted on equal terms to the *Sanhedrim* with the general, or generals, from Athens and Korinth, to say nothing of Sparta. Probably the six Peloponnesian cities were each represented by a strategos, Eurybiades for Sparta, Adeimantos for Korinth; the

τῶν εἰρημενέων πολίων, ἐβουλεύοντο, προθέντος Εὐρυβιάδεω γνώμην ἀποφαίνεσθαι τὸν βουλόμενον, ὅκου δοκέοι ἐπιτηδεότατον εἶναι ναυμαχίην ποιέεσθαι τῶν αὐτοὶ χωρέων ἐγκρατέες εἰσί· ἡ γὰρ Ἀττικὴ ἀπεῖτο ἤδη, τῶν δὲ λοιπέων πέρι προετίθεε. αἱ γνῶμαι δὲ τῶν λεγόντων αἱ πλεῖσται συνεξ-

---

2 *εἰρημενέων* Stein : *εἰρημένων* 3 *ἐπιτηδεώτατον* CP*dz* || *ποιήσεσθαι* R (Stein) SV (Gaisf.) || *χώρων* **B** : *χωρίων* *z* 5 *ἀφεῖτο* **B** : *ἀφεῖται* P*z* || *λοιπῶν* **B** || *πέρι* om. **B**

---

others are anonymous. The Athenians, Aiginetans, and Megarians may have each been represented by one and only one voice. Ambrakia and Leukas probably were represented by Korinth; the position of Chalkis, Eretria, and the rest is obscure. The Council may not have comprised more than 9–12 persons. In the sequel the only *dramatis personae* are Eurybiades, Adeimantos, Themistokles; the rest are mutes—unless we add Mnesiphilos and Aristeides. Themistokles should perhaps be regarded as protagonist; but, council or no council, it is evident that Eurybiades, in virtue of the Spartan *Hegemonia* and his own *Navarchia*, could do as he pleased: if he puts the question to the vote, it is merely for his own guidance; the result is not obligatory. The first council at Salamis may be taken to begin here; but the passages which follow are not sharply separated, but are in the nature of dissolving scenes.

3. **ὅκου δοκέοι κτλ.**: the question laid before the council of war is limited to the selection of a battle-ground; 'the previous question,' whether to fight a sea-battle at all or not, is treated as closed and determined. It is, however, assumed that the fleet must rest upon a friendly shore, and have a harbour to retire on. **τῶν** is relative, but **χωρέων** is genitive, not by inverse attraction, but in regular construction with *ὅκου*, though it seems to come in rather epexegetically.

5. **ἡ γὰρ Ἀττικὴ ἀπεῖτο ἤδη**: this statement, which may be conceived as Hdt.'s own, or as proceeding from Eurybiades upon the occasion, was not strictly true, so long at least as the Akropolis was still held by Athenians. The obfuscation of the defence of the Akropolis in the story which presently follows has perhaps reacted prejudicially upon the account of the deliberations at Salamis. The pluperfect force of *ἀπεῖτο* is emphasized by *ἤδη*. The phrase shows anyway that Salamis was no part of Attica.

τῶν δὲ λοιπέων: was there any other conceivable alternative but Salamis or the Isthmos?

6. **αἱ γνῶμαι δὲ τῶν λεγόντων**: the opinions of the speakers—not the votes of those present—and, moreover, but a majority of them. There was a minority argument, but it is not given here by Hdt. He reserves it to be produced on a later occasion. Evidently Themistokles (backed by the Megarians and Aiginetans) must already at this stage have used those arguments in favour of remaining and doing battle at Salamis, which are put into his mouth by Hdt. at a later stage—always supposing that the question of remaining and fighting at Salamis was still, or ever, an open one.

συνεξέπιπτον, 'were falling out together': sc. *ἀλλήλαισι*, i.e. were tending to agree, "de sententiis in unum convenientibus," Baehr, who perhaps rightly in this place derives the metaphor from casting of lots. Yet the sense might equally well (especially in view of the tense) be, 'were tending to fall (come, work) out to the same conclusion.' As the strategoi who spoke did not all speak together the tendency and result was cumulative and not instantaneous. *συνεξέπιπτε* is, however, used in 5. 22 of an occurrence which was single and instantaneous (though it has there nothing to say either to 'lots' or 'opinions'). In c. 123 *infra* the word might simply mean 'agreed.' An exact parallel to the present passage is found in 1. 206.

The construction of **πλώσαντας** is *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, as though *οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν λεγόντων* had preceded.

ἔπιπτον πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν πλώσαντας ναυμαχέειν πρὸ τῆς
Πελοποννήσου, ἐπιλέγοντες τὸν λόγον τόνδε, ὡς, εἰ νικηθέωσι
τῇ ναυμαχίῃ, ἐν Σαλαμῖνι μὲν ἐόντες πολιορκήσονται ἐν νήσῳ,
ἵνα σφι τιμωρίη οὐδεμία ἐπιφανήσεται, πρὸς δὲ τῷ Ἰσθμῷ
ἐς τοὺς ἑωυτῶν ἐξοίσονται. ταῦτα τῶν ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσου **50**
στρατηγῶν ἐπιλεγομένων, ἐληλύθεε ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος ἀγγέλλων
ἥκειν τὸν βάρβαρον ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν πυρπο-
λέεσθαι. ὁ γὰρ διὰ Βοιωτῶν τραπόμενος στρατὸς ἅμα

---

7 πλώσαντες *z* 8 τόνδε : τοῦτον **B** || εἰ : ἢν **B**P*z*, Baehr, Holder, van H. 9 μενέοντες **B** || [ἐν νήσῳ]? van H. 10 οὐδεμία P : οὐδεμίη S*z* : οὐδὲ μίη || φανήσεται **B** **50.** 2 ἐληλύθεε Werfer : ἐλήλυθε

---

7. **πρό** seems to have a double significance, both local and causal. Cp. Index.

8. **ἐπιλέγοντες τὸν λόγον τόνδε**, 'adding this argument, or consideration . . ' But the speech can hardly have been an ἐπίλογος to the γνῶμαι, containing, as it does, the pith and marrow of the arguments for adjourning to the Isthmos: a defeat at Salamis would mean a πολιορκία ἐν νήσῳ—and a siege meant inevitable starvation and surrender. Themistokles no doubt would have met such an argument at once with his three reasons: c. 60 *infra*.

εἰ νικηθέωσι . . πολιορκήσονται is doubly remarkable to the grammarian. (*a*) εἰ without ἄν with the subjunctive Stein defends by ref. to 2. 13 εἰ (μὴ) . . ἀναβῇ : 4. 172 ὡς . . μιχθῇ : 1. 132 ὡς ἐθέλῃ : c. 22 *supra* ἐπεῖτε ἀνενειχθῇ, and other temporal clauses (*vide* Stein's note to 4. 172). We have εἰ with the subj. in questions, as in εἰ στρατεύηται 1. 53, εἰ ἀνέλωνται 2. 52, etc., not exact parallels to this case. If the reading here is maintained (*vide* App. Crit.) the condition may be understood as emphasizing the probability of defeat; it is merely a question of time. (*b*) πολιορκήσονται is passive in sense; cp. c. 70 *infra*.

11. **ἐς τοὺς ἑωυτῶν ἐξοίσονται**, 'they will have their own folks to fall back on'; the verb perhaps suggesting further their wrecked and shattered condition; cp. ἐξοισομένων c. 76 *infra*, ἐξενειχθέντα c. 96 *infra*.

50. 1. **τῶν ἀπὸ Π. στ. ἐπιλεγομένων**: the verb means 'pondering, considering'; cp. 7. 49, 149, 236, etc. (Contr. the verb in the active just above.) The local designation of the doubters is important.

2. **ἐληλύθεε**: whether pluperfect or not (cp. App. Crit.) his arrival anticipates the *decision* of the deliberating generals in council. This anonymous messenger reports only what was to be fully expected, unless indeed the defence of the Akropolis was more seriously intended than appears from the subsequent narrative. But with this message, vague in its form, the narrative breaks off, only to be resumed in c. 56 *infra*, where the Greeks have learnt further of the capture and destruction of the Akropolis: a different matter to this first message.

3. **πᾶσαν** cannot be taken here to cover the destruction of the Akropolis, a disaster which would have demanded more precision in the messenger's report.

πυρπολέεσθαι: *igne vastare*, a word used (in the active) by Aristophanes frequently, and by Xenophon (*Cyr.* 3. 3. 25), and found in Homer, *Od.* 10. 30, but not elsewhere in Hdt.

4. **ὁ γὰρ κτλ.** introduces what is virtually a digression, resuming the narrative of the advance of the Persian army, from c. 39, or even from c. 34 *supra*. There was perhaps a concentration of the Persians in W. Boiotia (Koroneia ?)—to which point the centre would have advanced by Parapotamioi and Chaironeia, the left wing, from Abai, by Aspledon and Orchomenos, the right wing, by Lilaia — Delphi — Panopeus—Chaironeia, or possibly even by Trachis—Amphissa—Delphi—Lebadeia.

Thespiai and *Plataiai* may have been destroyed by an advance of the column from Delphi; or by an excursion from Thebes, where no doubt the Persian force was concentrated: the Plataians serving on the fleet had reached home

Ξέρξῃ, ἐμπρήσας Θεσπιέων τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἐκλελοιπότων ἐς
Πελοπόννησον, καὶ τὴν Πλαταιέων ὡσαύτως, ἧκέ τε ἐς τὰς
Ἀθήνας καὶ πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἐδηίου. ἐνέπρησε δὲ Θέσπειάν τε
51 *καὶ Πλάταιαν πυθόμενος Θηβαίων ὅτι οὐκ ἐμήδιζον. ἀπὸ δὲ*
τῆς διαβάσιος τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου, ἔνθεν πορεύεσθαι ἤρξαντο
οἱ βάρβαροι, ἕνα αὐτοῦ διατρίψαντες μῆνα ἐν τῷ διέβαινον
ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην, ἐν τρισὶ ἑτέροισι μησὶ ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ,

---

5 *αὐτῶν*: *ἐκ τῶν* **B**: *αὐτέων* z 6 *τὴν*: *τῶν* **B**: an *τὴν τῶν*? 7 *ἐδήου* **B**: *ἐδῄου* z || *δὲ* et *τε* om. **B** || *θέσπιαν* **B**: *Θέσπεάν* z **51.** 3 *μῆνα* om. **B** (Holder): *μῆνα διατρίψαντες* S (Gaisf.) 4 *μήνεσι* **B** ('iniuria probatum Schaefero et Gaisfordio' van H.)

---

in time to take part in the flitting to Peloponnesos; cp. c. 44 *supra.*

Hdt. evidently thinks that the whole land-forces of Xerxes entered Attica by one and the same road; cp. c. 113 *infra.* This supposition is absurd. From Thebes into Attica three routes would have been available. I. Right, or west, by Eleutherai—Eleusis (detaching a force against Plataiai?): probably the best and easiest route, then as now. II. Central, by Panakton—Phyle—Acharnai: the most direct, and also the most difficult. III. Left, or east, by Tanagra and Dekeleia (cp. 9. 15 *infra*), a considerable circuit, but a good and much frequented road. Probably the Persians used all three, both going and coming; doubtless also a considerable force was left behind in Boiotia, and garrisons all along the king's route to the rear. The singulars **Θέσπεια, Πλάταια** are unique in Hdt.

51. 1. **ἀπό**: temporal; cp. cc. 54, 55 *infra.*

2. **τῆς διαβάσιος τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου**: cp. 7. 54–56 *supra.* The Hellespont is here, curiously enough, treated as the starting-point of the march (**ἔνθεν πορεύεσθαι ἤρξαντο οἱ βάρβαροι**). In Bk. 7 the passage of the Hellespont is a mere episode on the march from Sardes in 480 B.C., and the start is made from Sardes with great pomp and circumstance (7. 37–40). Again, in Bk. 7. 56 the passage of the Hellespont occupies seven days and seven nights, just a week of our reckoning: here, a month is spent in passing the Hellespont (**ἕνα αὐτοῦ διατρίψαντες μῆνα ἐν τῷ διέβαινον ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην**). It might be possible to 'harmonize' the two statements by supposing that the month covers all the time spent on the Hellespont; but such a harmony is not convincing. The month might as well cover all the period from the start at Sardis: and in any case the discrepancy remains, and suggests a difference of source. The passages in Bk. 7 are probably from Asianic sources. The passage before us here is hardly less obviously from the European side, and presumably from Attic authority, as the Archontate suggests. It is important to recognize the *insouciance* with which Hdt. writes down in different contexts different data from different sources, without troubling himself to rationalize them; cp. Introduction, § 10. This acceptance of the local source for all it may be worth is of the essence of Hdt.'s method, or unmethod; it is half the secret of his charm, and the chief cause of his value; the unity of his work is a literary, a poetic illusion, not a scientific miracle.

4. **ἐν τρισὶ ἑτέροισι μησί.** The meaning is not so self-evident as might be wished. How are the 'months' computed? By the calendar? Or purely by the interval between start and arrival? Are we to understand that just ninety days, or rather less, separated Sestos and Athens on the Persian march? Or are the months three months of the Attic calendar, Skirophorion, Hekatombaion, Metageitnion, for example? In either case the three months seems an underestimate. The battle of Salamis was fought about the 20th of Boedromion (cp. c. 65 *infra*), and surely within a month of the arrival of the Persians in Athens. The fighting at Artemision-Thermopylai approximately synchronized with the Olympiad (7. 206 *supra*, but cp. c. 26 *supra*), i.e. could not at the earliest have fallen before the Attic new year, which suits the date for

Καλλιάδεω ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοισι. καὶ αἱρέουσι ἔρημον τὸ ἄστυ, καί τινας ὀλίγους εὑρίσκουσι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ ἐόντας, ταμίας τε τοῦ ἱροῦ καὶ πένητας ἀνθρώπους, οἳ φραξά-

5 ἐρῆμον CPz, van H. 7 ἱεροῦ A, Holder: cf. 55. 8 infra

Salamis and the Archontate. But to suppose that the battle of Salamis took place only ninety days or so after the passage of the Hellespont ascribes extraordinary activity to the Persian advance. Moreover, the start from Sardes will probably have taken place at latest in Elaphebolion (say March), and the passage of the Hellespont in Thargelion (say May). Taking the months here as Attic months, and reckoning exclusively, it might be correct to say that Xerxes reached Athens three months after leaving the Hellespont, i.e. in the fifth month, reckoning inclusively.

There is an exactly parallel case in Xenoph. *Hell.* 1. 4. 21, where Alkibiades is said to have quitted Athens τρίτῳ μηνὶ μετὰ τὸν κατάπλουν (407 B.C.). He had landed on Thargelion 25 (*ib.* § 12); he left after Boëdromion 20 (§ 20). This would be at least four months after, reckoning simply from arrival to departure, or in the fifth month, reckoning by Attic months, *nominatim*, or after a clear three months' interval, reckoned exclusively. The word ἑτέροισι here might favour this last method. (But does τρίτῳ μηνί in Xenophon perhaps = Βοηδρομιῶνι?) See further on the chronology Appendix IV. § 2.

5. **Καλλιάδεω ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοισι,** i.e. in the course of the year 480–479 B.C. = Ol. 75. 1. Cp. Clinton, *F. H. ad an.* But as there were twelve months in the year (and sometimes thirteen) this chronological indication, though highly acceptable on many grounds, leaves a good deal to be wished: if but the day of Xerxes' coming had happened to engrave itself upon the records! Probably it was a day towards the end of Metageitnion (say August) or beginning of Boëdromion (September).

τὸ ἄστυ, here, at least, must be admitted as contradistinguished from ἡ ἀκρόπολις, which they did not find deserted, or take without a struggle. Even in Attica they had picked up some 500 captives, if the story in 9. 99 *infra* be true as it stands, and the men there reported be not the remnant of the Akropolis garrison. The *Asty* was not apparently at this time sufficiently walled, or fortified, to enable it to stand a siege, or we may well doubt whether the Athenians would have evacuated Attica. It was, however, a πόλις τροχοειδής—unless, indeed, that description apply to the Akropolis, 7. 140.

6. **καί τινας ὀλίγους εὑρίσκουσι . . ἐόντας**: they discover a fact, perhaps to their astonishment, viz. that some few men of the citizens of Athens are in the Sacred Place—these words introduce an eminently apologetic and fictitious account of the defence and siege of the Akropolis, which was probably a far more serious and formidable undertaking than the story, devised in the light of events, expressly suggests. The men in the Akropolis were perhaps neither so few, so poor, so abject, so superstitious, nor so deplorable as the story assumes and asserts.

ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ: what temple is meant? Was this an old Erechtheion (cp. c. 55 *infra*), or was it the old 'Athenaeum' (so to speak) which had been enlarged by Peisistratos? Did Hdt. know anything of there being more than one temple on the Akropolis of Peisistratos? Or was there, in fact, more than one? Cp. Furtwaengler, *Masterpieces* (E.T.) Appendix, pp. 415 ff.; E. A. Gardner, *Ancient Athens*, c. iii. pp. 78 ff. Baehr would take τὸ ἱρόν here in a wider sense: *de toto loco diis ac potissimum Minervae consecrato in arce.* But its recurrence just below, and in c. 53, is against him.

7. **ταμίας τε . . καὶ πένητας ἀνθρώπους**: *prima facie*, the same persons are meant, but the ταμίαι τοῦ ἱροῦ, or more correctly ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας, for it surely must be these officials that are here intended (cp. G. Gilbert, *Handbuch* i.[2] 269), would of necessity have been assessed under the highest τίμημα, cp. Ἀθ. πολ. 7. 3, 8. 1. Their existence is demonstrable epigraphically before the middle of sixth cent., *C.I.A.* iv. 3. 373. They were not 'poor,' except in so far as the war had ruined them. **ἀνθρώπους** too is contemptuous: **φραξάμενοι** is a strict middle,

μενοι τὴν ἀκρόπολιν θύρῃσί τε καὶ ξύλοισι ἠμύνοντο τοὺς ἐπιόντας, ἅμα μὲν ὑπ' ἀσθενείης βίου οὐκ ἐκχωρήσαντες ἐς Σαλαμῖνα, πρὸς δὲ αὐτοὶ δοκέοντες ἐξευρηκέναι τὸ μαντήιον τὸ ἡ Πυθίη σφι ἔχρησε, τὸ ξύλινον τεῖχος ἀνάλωτον ἔσεσθαι· αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ κρησφύγετον κατὰ τὸ μαντήιον καὶ
52 *οὐ τὰς νέας. οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ἱζόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν καταντίον τῆς ἀκροπόλιος ὄχθον, τὸν Ἀθηναῖοι καλέουσι Ἀρήιον πάγον,*

---

9 *ἐκχωρήσαντας* z 10 *δὲ καὶ* **B**, Holder, van H. || *τῷ ἡ* malebat Valckenaer ('inutiliter' Gaisf.) 12 *αὐτὸ* : *καὶ αὐτὸ* Sz, van H., aliique : *αὐτὸ γὰρ?* Stein[3] || *εἶναι* : *ἔσεσθαι καὶ* **B** || *κατὰ τὸ μαντήιον* abesse malit van H. || *καὶ οὐ . . καταντίον* om. R 13 *νῆας* **B**z

---

and **ἠμύνοντο** a strict imperfect : **θύραι** not so much 'doors' torn from their hinges, as 'raft-like structures' (cp. 2. 96, Thuc. 6. 101. 3).

9. **ἅμα μὲν . . πρὸς δέ . .** : two reasons are given, one reflecting upon their material, the other upon their mental resources : they were poverty-stricken, deficient in means of livelihood ; yet they were proud, or conceited enough to have a private interpretation of the divine word (**αὐτοί**) : cp. *τοὺς πλέον τι ἐς τὸν χρησμὸν ἢ Θεμιστοκλῆς εἰδέναι νομίζοντας* Pausan. 1. 18. 2. These two reasons are *sibi repugnantia* (but this was written before the Lords decided that the 'Wee Frees' were in the right !) : anyway everything tends to depreciate the defenders of the Akropolis, and to betray the 'pragmatism' of the story !

10. **ἐξευρηκέναι τὸ μαντήιον**, '(to have discovered), to understand, (the true meaning of) the response.' The reference is, of course, to the story told 7. 140–144 ; cp. especially c. 142, where the justification of the *ξύλινον τεῖχος* is better explained than in this passage, which only suggests the extemporized *θύραι* and *ξύλα* of these poor wretches.

Replaced in its proper perspective, that is, after the fiasco at Thermopylai, the story of the Athenian *theoria* to Delphi, of the two responses, and the various interpretations thereof, gains immensely in point. The defence of the Akropolis may have been of the nature of a compromise, a concession, on the part of Themistokles ; yet it looks by no means inconsistent with his plan of a sea-fight at Salamis, and it might have had the effect of bringing the Peloponnesian army from behind the Isthmos into Attica to the rescue of the Akropolis : in any case, it occupied the Persian forces, and to some extent checked and divided them, and made *pro tanto* for the safety of Salamis and the success of the fleet.

11. **ἀνάλωτον ἔσεσθαι** : these words might have ended an hexameter, but as a matter of fact the actual verse ran *ἀπόρθητον τελέθειν*. The variation suggests that Hdt. is here following an independent story, without reference to 7. 141 *supra*.

12. **τὸ κρησφύγετον** : cp. 5. 124.

52. 1. **καταντίον** : right opposite the west end, where the ascent and entrance lay.

2. **τὸν Ἀθηναῖοι καλέουσι** : a phrase not taken from an Attic source, nor intended for an Attic audience.

Ἀρήιον πάγον. *πάγος* is a rocky point, or summit, as in Homer, *Od.* 5. 405 etc. The epithet may rather be connected with *ἀραί* than with *Ἄρης* originally, as the cult of the *Σεμναί* was certainly far more ancient on the spot than the cult of the war-god (cp. Aischyl. *Eumen.* 417, etc.), and it was with them and their rights that the Areiopagite court had to do ; though in the historical period the association with *Ἄρης* was fully recognized—perhaps in consequence of a pseud-etymology—and a temple to Ares actually stood on or near the rock : Pausan. 1. 8. 4, with notes, Frazer ii. 91, Hitzig-Bluemner i. 161 f. The topographical relation of the Areios rock, or Athenian Ebal, to the Akropolis fitted it to form a base for the Persian siege-operations, as once for the operations of the Amazones against the Theseian citadel ; so Aischyl. *Eumen.* 685 ff.—

ἐπολιόρκεον τρόπον τοιόνδε· ὅκως στυππεῖον περὶ τοὺς ὀιστοὺς
περιθέντες ἅψειαν, ἐτόξευον ἐς τὸ φράγμα. . . . ἐνθαῦτα
Ἀθηναίων οἱ πολιορκεόμενοι ὅμως ἠμύνοντο, καίπερ ἐς τὸ
ἔσχατον κακοῦ ἀπιγμένοι καὶ τοῦ φράγματος προδεδωκότος·
οὐδὲ λόγους τῶν Πεισιστρατιδέων προσφερόντων περὶ ὁμολογίης
ἐνεδέκοντο, ἀμυνόμενοι δὲ ἄλλα τε ἀντεμηχανῶντο καὶ δὴ καὶ
προσιόντων τῶν βαρβάρων πρὸς τὰς πύλας ὀλοιτρόχους
ἀπίεσαν, ὥστε Ξέρξην ἐπὶ χρόνον συχνὸν ἀπορίῃσι ἐνέχεσθαι
οὐ δυνάμενον σφέας ἑλεῖν. χρόνῳ δ᾽ ἐκ τῶν ἀπόρων ἐφάνη **53**
δή τις ἔξοδος τοῖσι βαρβάροισι· ἔδεε γὰρ κατὰ τὸ θεοπρόπιον
πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀττικὴν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ γενέσθαι ὑπὸ Πέρσῃσι.

---

52. 3 ἐπολιορκέοντο **B**(?) || στυππίον SV (Gaisf.): στυπεῖον CP*dz* 4 lacunam suspicatur Stein[3] 6 τοῦ κακοῦ *z* || φρήγματος *z* || προσδεδωκότος **B** 8 ἀντεμηχανῶντο **a**, Stein[2]: ἀνεμηχανέοντο **B**: ἀντεμηχανέοντο Stein[1] 9 ὀλοιτρόχους P*z*: ὅλοι τροχοὺς RS 10 ξέρξεα **B**P*z* **53.** 1 δὲ **B** 2 ἔξοδος Gomperz, Stein[2], van H.: ἔσοδος codd., Stein[1], Holder 3 τήν γε ἐν ? Kallenberg || ἐν: ἐπὶ **B**

πάγον δ᾽ Ἄρειον τόνδ᾽ Ἀμαζόνων ἕδραν,
σκηνάς θ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ἦλθον Θησέως κατὰ φθόνον
στρατηλατοῦσαι, καὶ πόλιν νεόπτολιν
τήνδ᾽ ὑψίπυργον ἀντεπύργωσαν τότε,
Ἄρει δ᾽ ἔθυον, ἔνθεν ἔστ᾽ ἐπώνυμος
πέτρα, πάγος τ᾽ Ἄρειος κτλ.

A passage which could hardly have been recited to an Athenian audience in 458 B.C. (Philokles) without vividly recalling the experiences of twenty-two years before (480, Kalliades). That there was a regular *πολιορκία* Hdt. expressly admits.

3. **ὅκως . . ἅψειαν, ἐτόξευον**: the construction is observable, the sense is clear: they wound tow round their arrows, ignited it, and discharged them into the fortified enclosure on the Akropolis. Nor does Hdt. mean that they discharged any other arrows than those so treated. *ἐτόξευον* is used absolutely (cp. c. 128 *infra*, where the construction *ὅκως γράψειε κτλ.* is more regular, or logical, than here).

6. **ἀπιγμένοι καὶ . . προδεδωκότος** is not quite regular: the *καί* is *de trop*; cp. 3. 127 *ἅτε οἰδεόντων . . καὶ ἔχων*. The p. or pl.p. participles mark the intense and utter certainty of their position. Also the words **ὅμως ἠμύνοντο** would more naturally come after **καίπερ κτλ.**

7. **τῶν Πεισιστρατιδέων**: they have not been heard of since 7. 6 *supra*, which does not look as if much of the intervening matter had come from the supposed 'Memoirs of Dikaios'; cp. Introduction, § 10.

9. **τὰς πύλας**: at the west end, where afterwards stood (and stand to some extent) the great Propylaia of Mnesikles and Perikles; cp. E. A. Gardner, *Ancient Athens*, 224 ff.

ὀλοιτρόχους, *ap. oracul.* 5. 92: no doubt 'round stones' that could be rolled down on the assailants. Where did these few poor creatures get these missiles? Were there any columns or pillar-drums lying about? (These, however, might have needed to have the gates opened for emission, which would not have done.)

10. **ἐπὶ χρόνον συχνόν** might mean almost any length of time, and is lamentably vague, but still goes to show the relative success of the desperate resistance.

ἀπορίῃσι ἐνέχεσθαι: a common expression; 7. 128, 9. 37, 98 etc.

53. 2. **ἔξοδος**, metaphorical; also a certain emendation. Cp. App. Crit.

ἔδεε γάρ: that the word of the god might be fulfilled! Cp. 7. 141 for the *θεοπρόπιον* in question, 5. 33 for the formula.

3. **πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀττικὴν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ**: a curious qualification, for where was there any *Ἀττική* except *ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ*? Salamis was no part of Attica; cp. c. 49 *supra*. Cp. also

ἔμπροσθε ὦν πρὸ τῆς ἀκροπόλιος, ὄπισθε δὲ τῶν πυλέων καὶ τῆς ἀνόδου, τῇ δὴ οὔτε τις ἐφύλασσε οὔτ' ἂν ἤλπισε μή κοτέ τις κατὰ ταῦτα ἀναβαίη ἀνθρώπων, ταύτῃ ἀνέβησαν τινὲς κατὰ τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Κέκροπος θυγατρὸς Ἀγλαύρου, καίτοι περ ἀποκρήμνου ἐόντος τοῦ χώρου. ὡς δὲ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ἀναβεβηκότας οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, οἳ μὲν ἐρρίπτεον ἑωυτοὺς κατὰ τοῦ τείχεος κάτω καὶ διεφθείροντο, οἳ δὲ ἐς τὸ μέγαρον κατέφευγον. τῶν δὲ Περσέων οἱ ἀναβεβηκότες πρῶτον μὲν ἐτράποντο πρὸς τὰς πύλας, ταύτας δὲ ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς

---

4 *πρὸ* om. **B**, Holder, van H. 6 *ταῦτα* : *τοῦτο* ? Stein², approb. van H. ('sed *κατὰ ταῦτα*, quod post *τῇ* abundat, glossema videtur' van H.) 7 *καίπερ* **B**, Holder, van H. 8 *δ'* **B** 9 *ἐπὶ* : *ἐς* **B** || *ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν* del. Cobet, Holder, (van H.)

---

6. 139. Perhaps *Ἀττική = Ἀθῆναι = Ἀθηναῖοι.*

γενέσθαι ὑπὸ Π. : cp. 7. 11.

4. **ἔμπροσθε . . πρὸ τῆς ἀκροπόλιος, ὄπισθε δὲ τῶν πυλέων καὶ τῆς ἀνόδου** : the position is further defined just below by the grotto of Aglauros. The place described is no doubt the north side, towards the west end. It is curious that Hdt. does not specify the point of the compass, or rather the quarter of the heavens, but Leake asserts that the north side is spoken of as 'the front'—so it might appear to the modern Athenian, the town lying mainly on the north side; so also to a Greek, perhaps, of Hdt.'s time, when the larger quarter of the town was on that same side; so to invaders, like the Persians, who had approached, perhaps, from the north side, or were laagering to a great extent there. The gates of an ancient citadel were seldom in 'the front,' but rather to the side; the case of the Athenian Akropolis, especially as we know it, may be peculiar, if not unique; and even at the time of the Persian siege the *πύλαι* may have presented a very different appearance, and one less suggestive of a front, or frontage, than the glorious building of Mnesikles. *πρό* looks *de trop*, but is plainly local.

6. **ἀνθρώπων** : to ascend by that route one had needs be *ἢ θηρίον ἢ θεός* !

7. **τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Κέκροπος θυγατρὸς Ἀγλαύρου** : for Kekrops cp. c. 44 *supra*, 7. 141. Aglauros was one of three sisters (Herse, Pandrosos); Pausan. 1. 18. 2. Athena entrusted to their charge an ark, containing Erichthonios, with strict orders not to look therein; Pandrosos obeyed, the other two opened the ark, went mad, and cast themselves headlong down from the Akropolis, *ἔνθα ἦν μάλιστα ἀπότομον.* There, or thereunder, was no doubt the sanctuary: *ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν Διοσκούρων τὸ ἱερὸν Ἀγλαύρου τέμενός ἐστιν*, Pausan. *l.c.* It probably communicated with the Akropolis by a flight of steps; Wachsmuth *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa i. 1829. Cp. E. A. Gardner, *Anc. Ath.* 526. Hdt. seems to think that the Persians clambered up the inaccessible cliff; possibly they ascended the steps. There were Athenians with them who might show the way—the suspicion of a betrayal is hard to resist.

καίτοι περ is a strong expression; *καίπερ* or *καίπερ τοι* would be less surprising. Hdt. evidently supposes this party of Persians to have scaled the rock. Curiously enough the garrison attempts, according to Hdt., no resistance, some leaping down from the wall to certain destruction, others taking refuge in the *Megaron*, where they were presently butchered.

11. **τῶν δὲ Περσέων κτλ.** : there is some obscurity or confusion in this passage. What 'gates' did these Persians open? If the gates of the Akropolis, we should expect them to admit the main force before slaughtering the suppliants. Did the suppliants too forgo all resistance? A good deal seems left here to the imagination. Who was there to tell the story if none of the Athenians escaped? Is this story from Athenian sources?

ἱκέτας ἐφόνευον· ἐπεὶ δέ σφι πάντες κατέστρωντο, τὸ ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.

Σχὼν δὲ παντελέως τὰς Ἀθήνας Ξέρξης ἀπέπεμψε ἐς **54** Σοῦσα ἄγγελον ἱππέα Ἀρταβάνῳ ἀγγελέοντα τὴν παρεοῦσάν σφι εὐπρηξίην. ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς πέμψιος τοῦ κήρυκος δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ συγκαλέσας Ἀθηναίων τοὺς φυγάδας, ἑωυτῷ δὲ ἑπομένους, ἐκέλευε τρόπῳ τῷ σφετέρῳ θῦσαι τὰ ἱρὰ ἀναβάντας ἐς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, εἴτε δὴ ὦν ὄψιν τινὰ ἰδὼν ἐνυπνίου ἐνετέλλετο ταῦτα, εἴτε καὶ ἐνθύμιόν οἱ ἐγένετο ἐμπρήσαντι τὸ ἱρόν. οἱ δὲ φυγάδες τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐποίησαν τὰ ἐντεταλμένα. τοῦ δὲ εἵνεκεν τούτων ἐπεμνήσθην, φράσω. ἔστι ἐν τῇ **55** ἀκροπόλι ταύτῃ Ἐρεχθέος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγομένου εἶναι νηός,

---

13 οἰκέτας **B**z || ἐπείτε δέ van H. 14 πᾶσαν om. **B** 54. 1 ἔχων δὲ παντελῶς **B** 3 εὐπραξίην **a**: εὐταξίην C 7 ἐνετέλλετο ταῦτα del. Krueger, van H. || ἐμπρήσαντα A[1] C: ἐμπρήσοντα B 55. 2 ἀκροπόλει **B**

---

13. **κατέστρωντο**: 9. 76 *infra*. **τὸ ἱρόν**: there is nothing to distinguish this from *τὸ μέγαρον* just above, or to show that Hdt. would have recognized the existence of more than one temple of Athene; cp. cc. 41, 51 *supra*.

54. 1. **σχὼν δὲ παντελέως τὰς Ἀθήνας**, 'having gained complete possession of Athens' (but not of the Athenians)—*παντ.*, cp. 7. 37 *supra*, 4. 95 (*π. εἶχε* in a different sense and construction); with *σχ.* cp. *ἔσχε* 5. 46, etc. The despatch to Artabanos is for a dramatic purpose, perhaps from a dramatic hint, cp. c. 99 *infra*. Artabanos has been left as major-domo 7. 52 *supra*. It is not to be supposed, in the light of c. 98 *infra*, that the one courier rode all the way from Athens to Susa. **ἄγγελον ἱππέα . . ἀγγελέοντα** is a little redundant; which noun is adj. may be doubted. Just below the man is a *κῆρυξ*.

3. **ἀπό**: temporal. The audience with the 'Peisistratidai,' Dikaios, and so forth, 'the Athenian exiles, those to wit (**δέ**) in his suite,' takes place on the next (**δευτέρῃ**) day. The behest to offer sacrifice according to Hellenic ritual on the Akropolis appears to be entirely in accordance with Achaimenid policy and practice, though Hdt. seems to think it demands special explanation. The wonder rather was that Xerxes deputed the duty: probably he 'assisted' at it, and the sacrifice is made on the king's behalf. The alternatives **εἴτε δὴ ὦν—εἴτε καί . .** are not mutually exclusive.

7. **ἐνθύμιον**, 'matter of conscience,' scruple, misgiving; cp. 2. 175; Thuc. 7. 50. 4 (of the lunar eclipse, Aug. 27, 413 B.C.).

τὸ ἱρόν, of Athene; cp. cc. 51, 53.

55. 1. **ἔστι**: presumably at the time of writing; the *νηός* referred to is apparently an Erechtheion, or contains the sacred memorials afterwards associated with the Erechtheion, Pausan. 1. 26. 5 ff. That temple was only built or restored, completely, long after the death of Hdt. This chapter is not free from ambiguity. Hdt. does not distinguish between the temple of Athene and 'the House of Erechtheus'; he speaks of the temple in a way as both existing and not existing—for it had just been burnt down—even on the day after the burning. It is quite possible that not merely the portent of the olive-shoot, but the whole circumstances of this story as first composed by Hdt., rested upon the authority of the Athenian *Emigrés*, at least ultimately, and that this passage may belong to the draft of these Books written before Hdt. himself had visited Athens. Cp. Introduction, § 9.

2. **Ἐρεχθέος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγομένου εἶναι.** The Erechtheus, who is the child of Earth, the nursling of Athene, taken into her own shrine (*ἑῷ ἐν πίονι νηῷ*) and therein worshipped by his people (*δῆμος*),

ἐν τῷ ἐλαίη τε καὶ θάλασσα ἔνι, τὰ λόγος παρὰ Ἀθηναίων Ποσειδέωνά τε καὶ Ἀθηναίην ἐρίσαντας περὶ τῆς χώρης μαρτύρια θέσθαι. ταύτην ὦν τὴν ἐλαίην ἅμα τῷ ἄλλῳ ἱρῷ κατέλαβε ἐμπρησθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων· δευτέρῃ δὲ ἡμέρῃ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπρήσιος Ἀθηναίων οἱ θύειν ὑπὸ βασιλέος κελευό-

---

3 παρὰ: παρ' z: ὑπὸ **B**   7 Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ z, vulg. || βασιλέως C: βασιλῆος z

---

Iliad 2. 546 ff., is no doubt one and the same ultimately with Poseidon Erechtheus (cp. c. 41 *supra*), as his *μαρτύρια*, the *θάλασσα*, and the *σχῆμα τριαίνης* (Pausan. 1. 26. 6) of themselves would show. A (possibly late) *ἱερὸς λόγος* made him son of Athene and Hephaistos, Apollod. 3. 14. 6. In *Od.* 7. 81 Athene goes in under the roof of Erechtheus (perhaps the older view?). Anyway, the reference in Homer as in Hdt. here is *prima facie* to an Erechtheion, but whether the House of Erechtheus had been absorbed in the Old Temple of Athene, which was destroyed by the Persians and never rebuilt, or whether there was an Erechtheion north of that temple, and more or less on the site of the existing building, is a moot point. Cp. c. 51 *supra*.

3. **ἐλαίη τε καὶ θάλασσα**: the existing temple comprised three *cellae*, of which the eastern one, or Erechtheion proper, contained *θαλάσσιον ἐν φρέατι* and also a *σχῆμα τριαίνης ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ . . ταῦτα δὲ λέγεται Ποσειδῶνι μαρτύρια ἐς τὴν ἀμφισβήτησιν τῆς χώρας φανῆναι*, Pausan. 1. 26. 5. Hdt. would probably have mentioned the *σχῆμα τριαίνης* had he seen it. In the Erechtheion also were three altars, one to Poseidon—*ἐφ' οὗ καὶ Ἐρεχθεῖ θύουσιν*—one to the hero Boutes, and one to Hephaistos. The central shrine was dedicate to the Polias, and contained, among many interesting objects, the olive (Pausan. 1. 27. 2, but cp. *l.c.* Apollod. *infra*), apparently a growing tree. The third, or western shrine, was dedicate to Pandrosos (cp. c. 53 *supra*).

λόγος παρὰ Ἀθηναίων: the phrase suggests that the passage is written for other than an Athenian audience; nor does it involve the inference that Hdt. had visited Athens before making this report. Cp. Introduction, § 10.

4. **Ποσειδέωνά τε καὶ Ἀθηναίην**: the myth of the *ἔρις περὶ τῆς χώρης* is given by Apollodoros 3. 14. 1, the event being dated to the days of Kekrops: *ἐπὶ τούτου, φασίν, ἔδοξε τοῖς θεοῖς πόλεις καταλαβέσθαι, ἐν αἷς ἔμελλον ἔχειν τιμὰς ἰδίας ἕκαστος. ἧκεν οὖν πρῶτος Ποσειδῶν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ πλήξας τῇ τριαίνῃ κατὰ μέσην τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνέφηνε θάλασσαν, ἣν νῦν Ἐρεχθηίδα καλοῦσι. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἧκεν Ἀθηνᾶ καὶ ποιησαμένη τῆς καταλήψεως Κέκροπα μάρτυρα ἐφύτευσεν ἐλαίαν, ἣ νῦν ἐν τῷ Πανδροσίῳ* (*sic*) *δείκνυται. γενομένης δὲ ἔριδος ἀμφοῖν περὶ τῆς χώρας Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ Ποσειδῶνα διαλύσας Ζεὺς κριτὰς ἔδωκεν, οὐχ ὡς εἶπόν τινες Κέκροπα καὶ Κραναόν, οὐδὲ Ἐρυσιχθόνα, θεοὺς δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ τούτων δικαζόντων ἡ χώρα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐκρίθη, Κέκροπος μαρτυρήσαντος ὅτι πρῶτον τὴν ἐλαίαν ἐφύτευσεν.* The evidence of Kekrops was on the showing of this myth untrue; the jury of the Twelve Gods was deceived. The most reasonable interpretation of the myth is the historical, which sees in it a transfigured reminiscence of a struggle between two cults, and the different worshippers of two deities, Athene-worshippers, Poseidon-worshippers, in Attica, in which case, further, the Poseidonians can be no other than Ionians, and the *Ἀθηναῖοι* may well be the natives. Cp. c. 44 *supra*; Roscher's *Lexikon* (1884), 683; Pauly-Wissowa ii. (1896) 1951; and especially L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, i. (1896) 270. The association of the olive with Athene marks her at least in this connexion as an agricultural deity (Roscher *l.c.*); the significance of the connexion of Poseidon with the *θάλασσα* is self-evident.

5. **μαρτύρια θέσθαι**: the substantive is appositive, or predicative.

ἅμα τῷ ἄλλῳ ἱρῷ, as well as the temple, or 'together with the temple as well.' The force of *ἄλλος* in such a construction is noticeable; cp. 7. 206. 2, and c. 65 *infra*, *ad f.* (also 4. 191, 5. 32, 6. 129, etc.).

6. **δευτέρῃ δὲ ἡμ. ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπρήσιος**: cp. c. 54 *supra*, from whence it follows that the *ἔμπρησις τῆς πόλεως* and the *πέμψις τοῦ κήρυκος* took place on the same day.

μενοι ὡς ἀνέβησαν ἐς τὸ ἱρόν, ὥρων βλαστὸν ἐκ τοῦ στελέχεος ὅσον τε πηχυαῖον ἀναδεδραμηκότα. οὗτοι μέν νυν ταῦτα ἔφρασαν <τῷ βασιλέι>.

Οἱ δὲ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι Ἕλληνες, ὥς σφι ἐξηγγέλθη ὡς ἔσχε **56** *περὶ τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἀκρόπολιν, ἐς τοσοῦτον θόρυβον ἀπίκοντο ὡς ἔνιοι τῶν στρατηγῶν οὐδὲ κυρωθῆναι ἔμενον τὸ προκείμενον πρῆγμα, ἀλλ' ἔς τε τὰς νέας ἐσέπιπτον καὶ ἱστία ἀείροντο*

---

8 *ἱρόν* : *ἱ//ρὸν* A (‘Herodotum ubique scripsisse *ἱερός* et *ἱερόν* probabile est propter vetustiores titulos Ionicos’ van H.) 9 *μὲν ὦν* **B** 10 <*τῷ βασιλέι*> Stein[3] **56.** 1 *ἐξαγγέλθη* **B**, vulg. 2 *τὰ περὶ* **B**, Stein[1 2], Holder, van H. ‖ *Ἀθηνέων* Bekker, Holder, alii 3 *ὡς* : *ὥστε* **B**, Holder, van H. 4 *νῆας* **B**z ‖ <*τὰ*> *ἱστία* Jacobitz

---

8. **τὸ ἱρόν**, as above, cc. 41, 51, 54.

βλαστὸν . . ἀναδεδραμηκότα : obviously a portent, a miracle, under the circumstances (**ὅσον τε** does not so much qualify as emphasize the cubit's length), explained by Dionys. Halic. 14. 4 as signifying *ὅτι ταχέως ἑαυτὴν ἡ πόλις ἀναλαβοῦσα βλαστοὺς ἀντὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἐξοίσει νέους*. Pausanias 1. 27. 2 makes the shoot two cubits length, on the same day as the burning. Blakesley sees references to the story in Soph. *O.K.* 698 ff. ; Eurip. *Ion* 1433.

56. 1. **οἱ δὲ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι Ἕλληνες** shifts the scene back to Salamis, as in c. 50 *supra* ; but what of the time? The message there is not *prima facie* identical with the message here ; and an appreciable interval of time might be held to occur between the news of the Persians' arrival in Athens and the news of the destruction of the Akropolis (cp. cc. 52, 53). But was it the news of the destruction of the Akropolis, or only the news of the blockade of the Akropolis, which reached the Greek camp? Hdt. does not here say clearly which. Would the destruction of the Akropolis have required to be reported? The conflagration would have been fully visible from Salamis. Whether reported or witnessed, the capture of the Akropolis might form a ground for reopening the question whether the Greek fleet should remain at Salamis or not. Perhaps the error in Hdt. lies in his having recorded a debate above, before the news of the Persian arrival, or the evidence of the Persian capture of the Akropolis, was conveyed to Salamis. As long as the Akropolis stood siege, there might be a hope that the Peloponnesian army would advance to its relief ; and so long at least the Greek fleet would of course remain at Salamis. Once the Akropolis had been captured, or surrendered, a new situation did arise. The anecdote of Mnesiphilos is transparently apocryphal ; but the notion that a debate on the next move arose after the capture of the Akropolis is not in itself so improbable.

ὡς : the word occurs four times in as many lines, but may be rendered differently : ‘when—how—that—as.’ But cp. App. Crit.

3. **ἔνιοι τῶν στρατηγῶν** : these members of the council of war (c. 49 *supra*) are to be supposed to have treated the news about the Athenian Akropolis as leaving only one alternative, or at least as rendering the retreat from Salamis inevitable. But it had not yet been decided, when ‘they tumbled into their ships’ (**ἐσέπιπτον** imp.), what the scene of the *naumachy* was to be. They may have intended to wait to hear this. The **θόρυβος** was not exactly a panic, it was a hubbub (they would be all speaking at the same time now) ; but no one as yet actually takes to flight, though **ἀποθευσόμενοι** seems to expect it (cp. App. Crit.). It is not very probable that any actual members of the *Synedrion* conducted themselves in this fashion : subordinate officers and crews may have made preparations on the safe side.

τὸ προκείμενον πρῆγμα seems to refer back to the subject of discussion in c. 49, *ὅκου δοκέοι ἐπιτηδεότατον εἶναι κτλ.*

4. **ἱστία ἀείροντο** : the voice is middle and the tense imperfect : even so, if they were in such a desperate hurry to be off, they would surely first get the *oars* out.

ὡς ἀποθευσόμενοι· τοῖσί τε ὑπολειπομένοισι αὐτῶν ἐκυρώθη πρὸ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ναυμαχέειν. νύξ τε ἐγίνετο καὶ οἳ διαλυθέντες
57 *ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου ἐσέβαινον ἐς τὰς νέας. ἐνθαῦτα δὴ Θεμιστοκλέα ἀπικόμενον ἐπὶ τὴν νέα εἴρετο Μνησίφιλος ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος ὅ τι σφι εἴη βεβουλευμένον. πυθόμενος δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ ὡς εἴη δεδογμένον ἀνάγειν τὰς νέας πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν καὶ πρὸ τῆς Πελοποννήσου ναυμαχέειν, εἶπε "οὔτ' ἄρα, ἢν ἀπαείρωσι [τὰς νέας] ἀπὸ Σαλαμῖνος, περὶ οὐδεμιῆς ἔτι πατρίδος*

---

5 *ἀποπλευσόμενοι* Naber || *αὐτέων* **B**z 6 *ἐγένετο* **B** 7 *νῆας* **B**z
57. 1 *Θεμιστοκλῆα* z 2 *νῆα* **B**z 4 *νῆας* **B**z 5 *οὔτ'* **a** : *οὗτοι* **B** : *οὔ τοι* Bekker, Holder, van H. : *οὐκ* Plutarch. Mor. 869 6 *ἀπαίρωσι* codd. z || *τὰς νέας* del. Stein[2] : *τὰς νῆας* **B**z || *περὶ οὐδὲ μιῆς* AB : *οὐδὲ περὶ μιῆς* Plutarch. l.c.

---

5. **τοῖσί τε ὑπολειπομένοισι αὐτῶν ἐκυρώθη**: how this decision was arrived at Hdt. does not clearly indicate; it might seem by a sheer majority of votes, but below Eurybiades is treated as really supreme in the matter. When the others left the council (was it held in a building or *sub Iove*?) the Isthmos was still *ex hypothesi* only one of several potential stations, cp. c. 49 *supra*. The decision is still to fight a battle: only the venue is shifted. This more dignified section did not 'tumble into their ships,' but **ἐσέβαινον**. On **πρό** cp. c. 49. The *parataxis* **νύξ τε ἐγ. καί** is observable: **οἵ** is doubtless demonstrative. **τὸ συνέδριον** marks the meeting decidedly as a regular and formal one; cp. 7. 145 *supra*, cc. 75, 79 *infra*; it was probably held under cover, in a house on shore, perhaps occupied by Eurybiades.

57. 1. **Θεμιστοκλέα**: not mentioned in the account of the first council (*συνέδριον*) on shore, *chez* Eurybiades; cc. 49 ff. But, of course, if any such meeting had been held, if any such decision arrived at, Themistokles had been there and against the making of it.

2. **Μνησίφιλος ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος**: a shrewder man than Themistokles, and one well and significantly named! Plutarch, *Them.* 2, makes him a demote of Themistokles, and in *Mor.* 795 an older man, quite naturally! But more critically in the *de Hdti. malig.* 37 f., *Mor.* 869, he points out the improbability of this tale, according to which Themistokles was dishonestly indebted to Mnesiphilos for the arguments in favour of giving battle at Salamis. Going beyond Plutarch, one might suspect that Mnesiphilos was a pure fiction, the only evidence of his existence being this apocryphal anecdote. Of course Hdt. did not invent him: the story is part of the Themistoklean legend, and perhaps among the older elements therein, forming perhaps the reply by some detractor to the foundation by Themistokles of the *ναὸν Ἀριστοβούλης Ἀρτεμίδος ἐν Μελίτῃ*.

3. **βεβουλευμένον . . δεδογμένον**, 'the matter of their deliberations,' 'the thing decided on': both words might seem to imply a joint decision; yet cp. 7. 12 *supra δεδογμένων οἱ*.

5. **εἶπε**: Hdt. and his sources do not hesitate to reproduce in *oratio recta* the *ipsissima verba* of Mnesiphilos to Themistokles: a device which adds nothing to the probability of the story in the eyes of a critical reader. Who else was present at the interview? Did Themistokles report it? Or Mnesiphilos?

οὔτ' ἄρα is answered by *ἀπολέεταί τε infra*. For *ἄρα* cp. Index.

6. **ἀπαείρωσι**: cp. c. 60 *infra*.

περὶ οὐδεμιῆς ἔτι πατρίδος ναυμαχήσεις: 'thou wilt no longer have a country to fight for at sea' might mean one of three things: (*a*) that Attica will be lost for ever—the context and explanation seem to rule this out as inadequate; (*b*) that there will no longer be any country belonging to any of the Greek peoples taken severally, to fight for—this would be far-fetched; (*c*) that Hellas will no longer exist to fight for. On the whole this appears to be the meaning—albeit it anticipates the second clause, and the use of *πατρίς* for the whole of Hellas is remarkable. The double negative *οὔτε*

ναυμαχήσεις· κατὰ γὰρ πόλις ἕκαστοι τρέψονται, καὶ οὔτε σφέας Εὐρυβιάδης κατέχειν δυνήσεται οὔτε τις ἀνθρώπων ἄλλος ὥστε μὴ οὐ διασκεδασθῆναι τὴν στρατιήν· ἀπολέεταί τε ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἀβουλίῃσι. ἀλλ᾽ εἴ τις ἐστὶ μηχανή, ἴθι καὶ πειρῶ διαχέαι τὰ βεβουλευμένα, ἤν κως δύνῃ ἀναγνῶσαι Εὐρυβιάδην μεταβουλεύσασθαι ὥστε αὐτοῦ μένειν."

58 *κάρτα τε τῷ Θεμιστοκλέι ἤρεσε ἡ ὑποθήκη, καὶ οὐδὲν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀμειψάμενος ἤιε ἐπὶ τὴν νέα τὴν Εὐρυβιάδεω. ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἔφη θέλειν οἱ κοινόν τι πρῆγμα συμμεῖξαι· ὁ δ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐς τὴν νέα ἐκέλευε ἐσβάντα λέγειν, εἴ τι θέλει. ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης παριζόμενός οἱ καταλέγει ἐκεῖνά τε πάντα τὰ ἤκουσε Μνησιφίλου, ἑωυτοῦ ποιεύμενος, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ*

---

7 *πόλιας* **B**Pz 9 *οὐ μὴ* **a** 10 *καὶ* del. van H. 12 *εὐρυβιάδεα* **B** || *μεταβαλέσθαι, ὥστ᾽* **B** || *μενέειν* **B**, Stein[1] **58.** 2 *τε* **B** : *δὲ* **a** : *δὴ* z : 'fortasse *τε δὴ*' Kallenberg || *τῷ* om. **B** 3 *νῆα* **B**z 4 *ἐθέλειν* **a**, Holder, van H. || *συμμῖξαι* Stein[1 2] || *δὲ* **B** 5 *νῆα* **B**z || *ἐμβάντα ἐκέλευε* **B** || *ἐσβάλοντα* B || *θέλοι* **B** || *ὁ* om. **B** 6 *παρεζόμενός* **a** || *γέ οἱ* **B** || *κεῖνά* **B**z

---

. . *οὐδεμιῆς* is purely intensive. The reading in Plutarch, *Mor.* 869, *οὐκ ἄρα . . οὐδὲ περὶ μιῆς ἔτι πατρίδος ναυμαχήσεις· κατὰ γὰρ πόλεις ἕκαστοι τρέψονται* appears to mean, the country for which you are going to fight will no longer be one and united; or, you will be fighting for a country divided into as many sections as states. The expression is not Herodotean (Krueger).

9. **ὥστε μὴ οὐ διασκεδασθῆναι τὴν στρατιήν**: an instance of a genuinely idiomatic *μὴ οὐ*, which follows not merely the alternative negatives *οὔτε . . οὔτε . .* but also perhaps the subordinate negation contained in the word **κατέχειν**, to restrain, prevent, prohibit. Cp. c. 100 *infra οὐ γάρ ἐστι Ἕλλησι οὐδεμία ἔκδυσις, μὴ οὐ δόντας λόγον κτλ.*, c. 119 *ἐν μυρίῃσι γνώμῃσι μίαν οὐκ ἔχω ἀντίξοον, μὴ οὐκ ἂν ποιῆσαι βασιλέα τοιόνδε.*

11. **διαχέαι**, to upset, confound, undo. The verb is used in the literal sense 6. 119.

τὰ βεβουλευμένα = *τὰ δεδογμένα.*

12. **μεταβουλεύσασθαι**: cp. 7. 12 *supra μετὰ δὴ βουλευέαι*—there too of a change of decision, resolve, counsel, by a single individual; cp. 1. 3 *supra.*

58. 2. **ὑποθήκη**: the suggestion; 6. 52, 1. 156, 211.

οὐδὲν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀμειψάμενος: not even, for example, that he had pointed all that out already. The arguments were irrefutable, and obvious. The remark has a somewhat unfavourable suggestion about it, as of an incriminating silence! See below.

3. **ἤιε**: afoot, or in a boat? It is not quite clear. As just below he asks Eurybiades *ἐκ τῆς νεὸς ἐκβῆναι*, Eurybiades was on board, and his ship presumably in the water. Moreover, the strategoi in c. 56 *supra* have not to launch their galleys. It seems more probable that the ships were all afloat. In c. 83 *infra* Themistokles addresses a *σύλλογον τῶν ἐπιβατέων* on land; but that would not show that the ships were not in the water.

4. **κοινόν**: of public concern; *e re publica.* **συμμεῖξαι**, in the sense 'to communicate,' is observable.

6. **παριζόμενος**: was Eurybiades abed?

καταλέγει ἐκεῖνά τε . . καὶ προστιθείς looks a little irregular. But the sentence here is complete without *προστιθείς*, which is 'epexegetical.' So too *τάξαντες* in 9. 10 *infra.* 1. 8 is more remarkable.

ἐκεῖνά τε πάντα: there had not been so many points; practically but one.

7. **ἑωυτοῦ ποιεύμενος** enforces the unfavourable insinuation above conveyed in *οὐδὲν ἀμειψάμενος*, more explicitly.

ἄλλα πολλά: perhaps arguments —if so, what? Perhaps only entreaties, prayers, etc. (**χρηίζων**). In either case

προστιθείς, ἐς ὃ ἀνέγνωσέ <μιν> χρηίζων ἔκ τε τῆς νεὸς
59 *ἐκβῆναι συλλέξαι τε τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἐς τὸ συνέδριον. ὡς*
δὲ ἄρα συνελέχθησαν, πρὶν ἢ τὸν Εὐρυβιάδην προθεῖναι τὸν
λόγον τῶν εἵνεκα συνήγαγε τοὺς στρατηγούς, πολλὸς ἦν ὁ
Θεμιστοκλέης ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι οἷα κάρτα δεόμενος· λέγοντος
δὲ αὐτοῦ, ὁ Κορίνθιος στρατηγὸς ['Αδείμαντος ὁ 'Ωκύτου]
εἶπε "ὦ Θεμιστόκλεες, ἐν τοῖσι ἀγῶσι οἱ προεξανιστάμενοι
ῥαπίζονται." ὁ δὲ ἀπολυόμενος ἔφη "οἱ δέ γε ἐγκαταλει-
60 *πόμενοι οὐ στεφανοῦνται." τότε μὲν ἠπίως [πρὸς] τὸν*
Κορίνθιον ἀμείψατο, πρὸς δὲ τὸν Εὐρυβιάδην ἔλεγε ἐκείνων

---

8 *μιν* Stein[(2) 3] ‖ *νῆος* **B***z* 9 *ἐκβῆναι τὸν εὐρυβιάδεα* **B***z* **59.** 2 *ἄρα* om. **B** ‖ *εὐρυβιάδεα* **B***z* ‖ *προσθεῖναι* **a** ‖ *τὸν* del. Cobet, van H. 3 *πολὺς* codd., *z* 5 *Κορινθίων* Kallenberg: 'si *στρατηγὸς* genuinum, requiro *Κορινθίων*' van H.: emblema seclusi ‖ *ὁ* om. **B** 6 *ὦ* om. **B** ‖ *θεμιστόκλεις* **B** 8 *στεφανεῦνται* **B** **60.** 1 *τότε*: *τοῦτο* Naber ‖ *πρὸς* del. Krueger, Holder, van H., Stein[3] 2 *ἠμείψατο* **B**: *ἀμείβεται* Krueger: aut *πρὸς* aut hoc suspectum hab. Stein[2] ‖ *εὐρυβιάδεα* R*z*

---

the phrase should not be held to cancel the insinuations to Themistokles' discredit, albeit somewhat weakening them. Once started on this line—by Mnesiphilos—he can find further pleas of himself, till finally, at the ensuing council, he makes a really powerful speech!

9. **τὸ συνέδριον**: evidently held on land, but not necessarily *sub Iove frigido*.

59. 2. **συνελέχθησαν**: this will be the second or the third meeting, according as cc. 49 and 56 are interpreted of one and the same meeting, or of two different meetings.

πρὶν ἢ . . τοὺς στρατηγούς: if *προθεῖναι τὸν λόγον* means 'to give account of,' 'to explain,' the statement appears again to be designed to discredit Themistokles; in any case, the commander-in-chief must surely have offered some reason for the extraordinary summons of this meeting, which is apparently to be conceived as taking place at night.

3. **πολλὸς ἦν . . ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι**: i.e. *π. ἦν λέγων*, surely not simply 'made a long speech,' or even 'said a great many things,' but rather 'was vehement'; cp. 7. 158 *supra*, 9. 91 *infra*. But what, by the way, could he have said, if Eurybiades had the subject of debate still *in petto*?

4. **οἷα κάρτα δεόμενος**: cp. c. 3 *supra*.

6. **προεξανιστάμενοι**: so in the aorist, 9. 62 *infra*. *προ-* with the force of 'too soon,' 'prematurely,' 'before they are bidden.' Competitors are referred to, not merely spectators, as, indeed, the answer of Themistokles implies.

7. **ῥαπίζονται**: by the *ῥαβδοῦχοι*, who kept order in the ring. Our athletes would hardly appreciate this severity. For the word cp. 7. 35.

ἀπολυόμενος, 'trying to excuse himself,' sc. *τὴν αἰτίην, τὴν διαβολήν*. He understood the value of the soft answer, which, however, failed on this occasion. Plutarch, *Them.* 11, substitutes Eurybiades for Adeimantos in this duel of wit, and adds a second *mot* by Themistokles to Eurybiades, who raises his baton to strike: *πάταξον μὲν ἄκουσον δέ*. In the *Mor.* 185 he restores the remark to the Korinthian.

δέ γε, 'yes, but . .'

ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι, i.e. who get a bad start, not "longe in cursu post tergum relicti victique," Wesseling, nor "qui cunctanter ad certamen prodeunt," Sintenis. 2 *Cor.* 4. 9 *διωκόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι* does not help us.

60. 1. **[πρὸς] τὸν Κορίνθιον ἀμείψατο**: a doubtful construction, not justified by *πρὸς ταῦτα ἀμειψάμενος*, c. 58 *supra*; cp. App. Crit.

2. **ἐκείνων μὲν . . ὁ δέ**: the subject expressed and resumed with *δέ*, cp. 7. 50, etc. *ἐκείνων* is of course neuter.

μὲν ἔτι οὐδὲν τῶν πρότερον λεχθέντων, ὡς ἐπεὰν ἀπαείρωσι ἀπὸ Σαλαμῖνος διαδρήσονται· παρεόντων γὰρ τῶν συμμάχων οὐκ ἔφερέ οἱ κόσμον οὐδένα κατηγορέειν· ὁ δὲ ἄλλου λόγου εἴχετο, λέγων τάδε. "ἐν σοὶ νῦν ἐστι σῶσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἢν ἐμοὶ πείθῃ ναυμαχίην αὐτοῦ μένων ποιέεσθαι, μηδὲ πειθόμενος τούτων τοῖσι λόγοισι ἀναζεύξῃς πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν τὰς νέας. ἀντίθες γὰρ ἑκάτερον ἀκούσας. πρὸς μὲν τῷ Ἰσθμῷ συμβάλλων ἐν πελάγεϊ ἀναπεπταμένῳ ναυμαχήσεις, [ἐς] τὸ ἥκιστα ἡμῖν σύμφορον ἐστὶ νέας ἔχουσι βαρυτέρας καὶ ἀριθμὸν ἐλάσσονας· τοῦτο δὲ ἀπολέεις Σαλαμῖνά τε καὶ Μέγαρα καὶ Αἴγιναν, ἤν περ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα εὐτυχήσωμεν. ἅμα δὲ τῷ ναυτικῷ αὐτῶν ἕψεται καὶ ὁ πεζὸς στρατός, καὶ οὕτω σφέας αὐτὸς ἄξεις ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον, κινδυνεύσεις τε ἁπάσῃ τῇ Ἑλλάδι. ἢν δὲ τὰ ἐγὼ λέγω ποιήσῃς, τοσάδε ἐν αὐτοῖσι χρηστὰ εὑρήσεις· πρῶτα μὲν ἐν στεινῷ συμβάλλοντες νηυσὶ ὀλίγῃσι πρὸς πολλάς, ἢν τὰ οἰκότα [ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου] ἐκβαίνῃ,

---

3 *ἔτι*: *οὐκέτι* **β**, Holder, van H. || *ἀπαίρωσι* codd., *z* 5 *κακηγορέειν* Valckenaer: *κακηγορεῖν* van H. 7 *μένων* om. **β** 8 *λόγοισι* Krueger, Stein^2: *λέγουσι* 9 *νῆας* **β***z* 10 *συμβαλὼν* RS || *ἐς* del. Krueger, Holder, van H., Stein^3 || *τὸ* Struve: *ὃ* 11 *νῆας* **β***z*: 'an *ἀνάγειν νέας*? Stein$^{1\,2}$ || *βραδυτέρας* coni. Stein, recep. van H.: *βραχυτέρας* Matthiae 12 *ἐλάσσονα* **α** 13 *ἤν περ τἄλλα* **β** || *δὲ* Stein^2: *γὰρ* 14 *στρατός* om. *z* 15 *αὐτοὺς* **β** 16 *ποιῇς* **α** 17 *συμβαλόντες* **β** 18 *ἐοικότα* **α** || *ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου* secl. Stein^2

---

3. **ἀπαείρωσι**, as in c. 57 *supra*. **διαδρήσονται** is emphatic, and the *δια-* signifies 'in various directions'; the word is perhaps more contemptuous than *διασκεδασθῆναι*, c. 57.

5. **οὐκ ἔφερέ οἱ κόσμον οὐδένα**, 'it by no means beseemed him'; cp. *κόσμον φέρον*, c. 142 *infra*.

κατηγορέειν: sc. *τί τινος*: cp. 7. 205 *supra*, 2. 113; cp. App. Crit.

ἄλλου λόγου εἴχετο: cp. 7. 5 *τοιούτου λόγου εἴχετο, λέγων κτλ.*

6. **λέγων τάδε.** The *ipsissima verba* of Themistokles in 480 B.C. as of Miltiades in 490 B.C., 6. 109. The one speech is modelled on the other as far as the circumstances admit, but this may be the prior one in Hdt.'s composition.

7. **αὐτοῦ**, 'where you are . . '

8. **ἀναζεύξῃς**: with *τὸν στρατόν* 9. 41, 58, 6. 12; but the word is frequently intransitive, or elliptical, and generally used of the movements of land-forces; cp. App. Crit.; 'break up and move to the Isthmos.'

9. **ἀντίθες**: Themistokles' oratory, in Hdt.'s conception, runs to antitheses, cp. c. 83 *infra*; and to figures, cp. cc. 109, 111 *infra*.

πρὸς μέν: the correspondence or antithesis comes with *ἢν δὲ τὰ ἐγὼ λέγω infra*.

10. **συμβάλλων**: sc. *τοῖς ἐναντίοις*, or *τῷ βαρβάρῳ*, or *sim*.

π. ἀναπεπταμένῳ: *in patenti pelago* (Valla): *ἀναπεπταμένους τόπους*, Plato *Phaedr.* 111 C.

11. **βαρυτέρας**: were the Greek ships heavier than the Persian (Phoenician)? Plutarch *Them.* 14 says just the opposite. 'Heavier' might be taken to mean 'less easy to manage' (*χεῖρον πλέουσας*), and be referred to the crews and seamanship rather than to the actual material of the fleet. But cp. App. Crit.

12. **τοῦτο δέ**: the *τοῦτο μέν* has not preceded. It may be ideally supplied before *ἐν πελάγει ἀναπ. ναυμαχήσεις*—where the proximity of *πρὸς μέν* might account for its omission.

18. **ἢν τὰ οἰκότα . . ἐκβαίνῃ, πολλὸν κρατήσομεν.** Themistokles, according

πολλὸν κρατήσομεν· τὸ γὰρ ἐν στεινῷ ναυμαχέειν πρὸς ἡμέων ἐστί, ἐν εὐρυχωρίῃ δὲ πρὸς ἐκείνων. αὖτις δὲ Σαλαμὶς περιγίνεται, ἐς τὴν ἡμῖν ὑπεκκέεται τέκνα τε καὶ γυναῖκες. καὶ μὴν καὶ τόδε ἐν αὐτοῖσι ἔνεστι, τοῦ καὶ περιέχεσθε μάλιστα· ὁμοίως αὐτοῦ τε μένων προναυμαχέεις Πελοποννήσου καὶ πρὸς τῷ Ἰσθμῷ, οὐδὲ σφέας, εἴ περ εὖ φρονέεις, ἄξεις ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον. ἢν δέ γε καὶ τὰ ἐγὼ ἐλπίζω γένηται καὶ νικήσωμεν τῇσι νηυσί, οὔτε ὑμῖν ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν παρέσονται οἱ βάρβαροι οὔτε προβήσονται ἑκαστέρω τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἀπίασί τε οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ, Μεγάροισί τε κερδανέομεν περιεοῦσι καὶ Αἰγίνῃ καὶ Σαλαμῖνι, ἐν τῇ ἡμῖν καὶ λόγιον ἐστὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν κατύπερθε γενέσθαι. οἰκότα μέν νυν βουλευομένοισι ἀνθρώποισι ὡς τὸ ἐπίπαν ἐθέλει <κατὰ νόον> γίνεσθαι· μὴ δὲ οἰκότα βουλευομένων οὐκ ἐθέλει οὐδὲ ὁ θεὸς προσχωρέειν πρὸς τὰς ἀνθρωπηίας γνώμας."

20 *αὖθις σαλαμὶς* **B** 21 *ὑπέκκειται* **a**z, van H.: *νῦν ἐγκεῖται* **B** 22 *μὴν*: *μὲν* R, Stein[2] || *περιέχεσθαι* B**B** 23 *τε*: *τῇδε* post Krueger van H. || *προναυμαχέεις* ABC, Stein[3]: *προναυμαχήσεις* SV, Stein[1,2], Holder, van H.: *πρὸς ναυμαχήσεις* R: *προσναυμαχήσεις* Marc. 25 *γε καὶ* om. **B**, *καὶ* tantum Marc., van H. 26 *ἡμῖν* **B**z 27 *ἑκαστέρωι* P: *ἑκατέρωι* **a**: *ἑκατέρω* **B**C: *ἑκαστέρῳ* z 31 <*κατὰ νόον*> Stein[3]: <*εὖ*> Krueger, Cobet, van H. || *μὴ οἰκότα δὲ* z 32 *βουλευομένων* Stein[3]: *βουλευομένοισι*

to Hdt., counts upon victory. Phormio *ap.* Thuc. 2. 90 seems to contradict the tactical principle here enunciated by Themistokles, but on the understanding that the smaller fleet is superior in manœuvring power, which the Greek fleet at Salamis (*νέες βαρύτεραι*) was not.

19. **πρὸς ἡμέων**, 'to our interest,' cp. c. 22 *supra*; the context also illustrates the use of *πρός* with accus. (*πρὸς πολλάς supra*), and with dative (*πρὸς τῷ Ἰσθμῷ infra*).

21. **ἐς τὴν κτλ.**: a pregnant construction. The singular verb is to be noticed. **τέκνα τε καὶ γ.**: cp. c. 44 *supra*.

22. **καὶ μὴν**: introducing a fresh argument. *αὐτοῦ τε μένων . . καὶ πρὸς τῷ Ἰσθμῷ* are co-ordinate alternatives.

περιέχεσθε: most of the address is in 2nd pers. singular. Themistokles by the plural here avoids accusing Eurybiades of partiality. Cp. App. Crit.

23. **προ-** in *προναυμαχήσεις*, cp. cc. 56, 57 *supra*. **εἰ . . φρονέεις**: sc. *εἰ αὐτοῦ μενέεις*, or *αὐτοῦ μένων*. The words merely resume the wise course.

27. **τῆς Ἀττικῆς** grammatically might be a partitive, or a comparative gen.; the context, and the fact asserted c. 50 *supra*, favour the comparative.

28. **οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ**: *nullo ordine*, c. 117, 9. 56, 65 *infra*, etc. **ἀπίασι** has plainly the future sense. **περιεοῦσι**, by its position, combines with *Αἰγίνῃ* and *Σαλαμῖνι* as well as with *Μεγάροισι*, 'we shall profit by the immunity of Megara, Aigina, Salamis.'

29. **λόγιον ἐστί** perhaps merely refers to his own interpretation of the lines *ὦ θειὴ Σαλαμὶς κτλ.*, 7. 142 *supra*. Themistokles is made to conclude with an apophthegm of heavy calibre (='God helps those that help themselves,' or 'Put your trust in God and keep your powder dry').

31. A subject (*χρηστά vel sim.*) were wanted for **ἐθέλει**, but for the emendation: cp. App. Crit.

32. **προσχωρέειν πρός**: to go to meet, to accede to, to further, men's plans; the construction and meaning are remarkable, and not easy to parallel; 9. 55 *infra ad f.* might serve best as commentary.

The speech here put into the mouth

Ταῦτα λέγοντος Θεμιστοκλέος αὖτις ὁ Κορίνθιος Ἀδεί- 61
μαντος ἐπεφέρετο, σιγᾶν τε κελεύων τῷ μὴ ἐστὶ πατρὶς καὶ Εὐρυβιάδην οὐκ ἐῶν ἐπιψηφίζειν ἀπόλι ἀνδρί· πόλιν γὰρ τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα παρεχόμενον οὕτω ἐκέλευε γνώμας συμβάλλεσθαι.

---

61. 1 *θεμιστοκλέους* **B**C*z* || *αὖθις* R || *Ἀδείμαντος* secl. Stein[2], Holder, van H. 2 *μή ἐστι* Stein[1] : *μὴ ἔστι* P*z* 3 *εὐρυβιάδεα* **B** || *ἐὰν* **B** || *ἀπόλιδι* **B**, van H. 4 *Θεμιστοκλῆα* *z*

---

of Themistokles is a brief and masterly *résumé* of the *pros* and *cons* of the case between Salamis and the Isthmos as the scene of the sea-fight, which (it is admitted and agreed) must be fought somewhere. The argument in the main is presented in a series of six antithetical considerations, which may be re-combined into three antithetical or double-edged assertions, followed by a peroration (iv.).

i. The narrow water of Salamis is in favour of the Greeks; the open sea off the Isthmos would tell in favour of the Persians.

ii. By moving to the Isthmos they will certainly lose Megara, Aigina, Salamis; by remaining where they are they will probably save them.

iii. They will defend the Peloponnesos as well, or even better, by remaining at Salamis; a defeat at the Isthmos will be final. The reasons for this last assertion are not quite fully given in the speech; only it is suggested that the Persian fleet and Persian army will be brought unduly near to the Peloponnesos, in which case a defeat would be very serious; Mnesiphilos above, and Themistokles himself, has taken the still more alarming view that if they once quit Salamis no battle will be fought at all.

iv. Finally, Themistokles adds that a divine promise of victory has been received, though they must not expect it to be fulfilled if they deliberately choose the less prudent alternative.

61. 1. **αὖτις**, 'again,' a second time; the first time being in c. 59 *supra*. Cp. *αὖτις δέ* c. 60 *supra* corresponding to *πρῶτα μέν* just before.

2. **πατρίς**, 'a fatherland'; cp. c. 57 *supra*, where Mnesiphilos regards Themistokles as possessing actually, or potentially, a *πατρίς* so long as the Greek fleet is kept together at Salamis.

3. **Εὐρυβιάδην οὐκ ἐῶν ἐπιψηφίζειν ἀπόλι ἀνδρί**, 'trying to prevent Eurybiades reopening the question (putting a question to the vote) for the benefit of (at the request of, to please) a landless (city-less) man: let Themistokles produce a city to which he belongs before (said he) offering us his advice.'

There seems to be no sufficient reason for abandoning (with Stein) the normal meaning of *ἐπιψηφίζειν* so as to make it mean 'to allow a vote to'—an interpretation which leads him to take *γνώμας συμβάλλεσθαι* in the sense 'mitzustimmen,' i.e. to vote with (us). In 5. 92 (*γνώμας ἀμείνονας συμβαλέσθαι ἤ περ νῦν*) the meaning is clearly 'to advise.' Against the normal interpretation Stein asks: *Warum sollte der Antrag eines heimatlosen Mannes nicht Gegenstand einer Abstimmung sein dürfen?* The point of the story as told by Hdt. appears to be that Adeimantos wishes to find some pretext on which to prevent the question being reopened. He objects to Themistokles, who is now a landless man, being allowed to propose a motion or an amendment, as subject for a vote in the council of war: he takes exception to a man, who no longer represents a state, having any opinion or proposal submitted to a vote.

There is, indeed, a radical flaw or inconsequence in the narrative of Hdt. in that, on the one hand, it implies that the question of remaining or going was to be decided by the votes of the majority, while, on the other hand, it no less clearly implies that the whole and sole decision rested with Eurybiades. But this inconsequence leaves the meaning of *ἐπιψηφίζειν* unaffected.

Stein quotes two late writers in support of his interpretation. Lucian *Tim.* 44 *ἐπεψήφισε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*. Diog. L. 7. 10 *ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρίᾳ τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν Ἵππων*. I should take *ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρίᾳ* as a remoter dative, or even locative, and so too *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, rather than as objectively constructed with *ἐπεψήφισεν*, and the verb itself as absolute. Cp. Thuc. 6. 14. 1 *ταῦτα . . ἐπιψήφιζε καὶ γνώμας προτίθει αὖθις Ἀθηναίοις*, where Nikias is pleading for 'the previous question.'

ταῦτα δέ οἱ προέφερε, ὅτι ἡλώκεσάν τε καὶ κατείχοντο αἱ
Ἀθῆναι. τότε δὴ ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης ἐκεῖνόν τε καὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους πολλά τε καὶ κακὰ ἔλεγε, ἑωυτοῖσί τε ἐδήλου λόγῳ ὡς εἴη καὶ πόλις καὶ γῆ μέζων ἤ περ ἐκείνοισι, ἔστ' ἂν διηκόσιαι νέες σφι ἔωσι πεπληρωμέναι· οὐδαμοὺς γὰρ Ἑλλήνων αὐτοὺς
62 *ἐπιόντας ἀποκρούσεσθαι. σημαίνων δὲ ταῦτα τῷ λόγῳ διέβαινε ἐς Εὐρυβιάδην, λέγων μᾶλλον <ἤδη> ἐπεστραμμένα. "σὺ εἰ μενέεις αὐτοῦ καὶ μένων ἔσεαι ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀνα-*

5 *προεφέρετο* **a**C || *αἱ* om. **β**P, Holder 6 *δή*: *δὲ* **β**: *δὲ δὴ* Valckenaer, van H. 7 *καλὰ* **β** 8 *μέζω* **β** 9 *νῆες* **β** || *οὐδαμῶς* **β** 10 *ἀποκρούσεσθαι* B**β**: *ἀποκρουέεσθαι* **62.** 2 *εὐρυβιάδεα* **β**z || <*ἤδη*> Stein[3] 3 <*μὲν*> *μενέεις* Werfer, Holder, van H.

5. **ἡλώκεσάν τε καὶ κατείχοντο**, 'had been taken and were in the hands of the enemy': the pl.p. and imp. tenses are noticeable.

6. **τότε δή**: a contrast to the former occasion, and the soft answer; *τότε*, c. 60 *supra*. Now Themistokles 'lets him have it.'

7. **ὡς εἴη καὶ πόλις καὶ γῆ . . ἔστ' ἂν διηκόσιαι νέες σφι ἔωσι π.**: the sequence is hardly quite regular. The 200 includes the ships lent to Chalkis. On **πεπληρωμέναι** cp. c. 46 *supra*. The formula that 'so long as they have 200 ships fully manned, the Athenians have both City and Land, greater than Korinth and Korinthia,' is ruined by the explanation that 'no Hellenes whom they attack will be able to resist them.' Nothing further is heard of the threat in this sense; and it spoils the beautiful crescendo of Themistokles' arguments, being the most direct and brutal, if that indeed was what he meant. He probably meant something quite different: 'Stone walls do not a *city* make.' The scholiast on Aischyl. *Pers.* 347 cites Alkaios; cp. Bergk, *P.L.G.* iii.[4] 156, Fr. 23 *ἄνδρες πόληος πύργος ἀρεύϊοι*. The passage in Aischylos runs:

ΑΤ. *ἔτ' ἆρ' Ἀθηνῶν ἔστ' ἀπόρθητος πόλις;*
ΑΓ. *ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἕρκος ἐστὶν ἀσφαλές.*

Sophokles formulates the idea still more explicitly, *Oid. Tyr.* 56 f. *ὡς οὐδέν ἐστιν οὔτε πύργος οὔτε ναῦς ἔρημος ἀνδρῶν μὴ ξυνοικούντων ἔσω.* The Athenians, far beyond most Greeks of the fifth cent. B.C., attained the conception of the ideal and spiritual character of the City, and its independence of the particular place and material conditions. Their invention of the *kleruchy*, in anticipation of the Roman *colonia civium opt. iur.*, is an evidence of that. A great stage in their education was doubtless the evacuation of Attica in 480 B.C., and it bore fruit sixty-eight years later, when in 412 B.C. the Athenian naval *στρατόπεδον* at Samos preserved the continuity of the Athenian Constitution, and formulated the conception of a polity virtually independent of place: Thucyd. 8. 76. It is but natural that the *Nephelokokkygia* of Aristophanes and the *Republic* of Plato are products of Attic genius. Cp. 7. 234. 9 *supra*.

62. 1. **σημαίνων δὲ ταῦτα**, 'with these significant hints.' **τῷ λόγῳ διέβαινε**, together.

2. **μᾶλλον ἐπεστραμμένα**: not more earnestly, vehemently, than he had spoken to Adeimantos—it could hardly have been so — but than before to Eurybiades. *ἐπεστραμμένος*, p.p. from *ἐπιστρέφειν*, seems here to = adj. *ἐπιστρεφής*, where it is not the 'turn' but the 'attention,' the aim, which is emphasized; cp. *ἐπιστρεφέως* 1. 30, and Plato *Prot.* 342 E *ἐνέβαλε ῥῆμα . . συνεστραμμένον ὥσπερ δεινὸς ἀκοντιστής*.

εἰ μενέεις . . καὶ ἔσεαι: the expression is hardly in strict grammar, and an *aposiopesis*, or a lacuna, might be suspected; so Baehr approves of Valckenaer's suggestion to supply mentally *σώσεις τὴν Ἑλλάδα*. But the excitement of the moment might account for some incoherence. Certainly **καὶ μένων** is tautologous, and *de trop.* One might try to force a special point in it: 'You, if you are going to remain—yea, in remaining (as you are now)—will be a good man and true.'

3. **ἀνατρέψεις τὴν Ἑλλάδα**: this might be described as *μᾶλλον ἐπεστραμμένον*

τρέψεις τὴν Ἑλλάδα· τὸ πᾶν γὰρ ἡμῖν τοῦ πολέμου φέρουσι αἱ νέες. ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πείθεο. εἰ δὲ ταῦτα μὴ ποιήσῃς, ἡμεῖς μὲν ὡς ἔχομεν ἀναλαβόντες τοὺς οἰκέτας κομιεύμεθα ἐς Σῖριν

---

5 *αἱ* om. **B** || *νῆες* **B** || *ποιήσεις* Pz, Holder, van H. 6 *σίριν* CPz

---

compared with *κινδυνεύσεις ἁπάσῃ τῇ Ἑλλάδι* c. 60 *supra.*

4. **τὸ πᾶν γὰρ ἡμῖν τοῦ πολέμου φ. αἱ νέες**: cp. *οὐδὲν πλέον ἐφέροντο* 7. 211 *supra*, *πλέον μέντοι ἔφερέ οἱ ἡ γνώμη κατεργάσασθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα* c. 100 *infra*, and more especially *ταῦτα μέν νυν ἐπὶ σμικρόν τι ἐφέροντο τοῦ πολέμου* 4. 130. 'The whole fate, or issue, of the war depends for us on the ships.' *ἡμῖν* need not be restricted to the Athenians.

5. **ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πείθεο**: cp. *Il.* 1. 259 *ἀλλὰ πίθεσθ'*, 2. 139 *ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εἴπω πειθώμεθα πάντες.*

εἰ . . ποιήσῃς: cp. c. 49 *supra.*

6. **ὡς ἔχομεν**, 'just as we are,' without more ado.

τοὺς οἰκέτας: cp. c. 41 *supra.*

Σῖριν τὴν ἐν Ἰταλίῃ: there was another 'Siris' in Paionia; cp. c. 115 *infra*; the Italiote Siris was on a navigable river of the same name, twenty-four stades distant from the (later) Herakleia (Strabo 264); it was in the neighbourhood of this river that Pyrrhus fought his first engagement with the Romans 280 B.C., Plutarch *Pyrrh.* 16.

The foundation legend is given by Strabo, *l.c.* Siris, originally a settlement of the Chonians (i.e. native Italians of that region, but cp. 9. 93 *infra*), was occupied by fugitive Trojans after the fall of Troy (hence the worship of the winking Athene in the city, Strabo *l.c.*). At a later time Ionians flying from the Lydian conqueror (temp. Gygis?) occupied the town. The Ionians were apparently from Kolophon, and under them the Ionian city, in the midst of Achaian neighbours, rose to great prosperity, and rivalled Sybaris and Kroton in wealth and luxury. (Athen. 523 *καὶ οἱ τὴν Σίριν* (*sic*) *δὲ κατοικοῦντες, ἣν πρῶτοι κατέσχον οἱ ἀπὸ Τροίας ἐλθόντες, ὕστερον δὲ Κολοφώνιοι, ὥς φησι Τίμαιος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης, εἰς τρυφὴν ἐξώκειλαν οὐχ ἧσσον Συβαριτῶν.*) The fertility of its soil was proverbial: *οὐ γάρ τι καλὸς χῶρος οὐδ' ἐφίμερος οὐδ' ἐρατὸς οἷος ἀμφὶ Σίριος ῥοάς*, Archilochos *ap.* Athen. *l.c.*, Bergk ii.[4] 389, No. 21. Among the suitors of Agariste (*circ.* 570 B.C.) figured Damasos, son of Amyris, *τοῦ σοφοῦ λεγομένου*, 6. 127 *supra.* It must have been after that epoch, and before the destruction of Sybaris by Kroton (see 5. 44), that the Achaian colonies, Metapontion, Sybaris, and Kroton, combined to destroy Siris (Trogus Pomp. *ap.* Justin. 20. 2. 3 ff.), and apparently accomplished their purpose, notwithstanding the alliance of the Sirites with Lokroi. Siris must have continued to be inhabited, as 'a member of the Achaian confederacy' (B. Head, *Historia Numorum*, p. 69), and stood in intimate commercial relation with the town of Pyxos, a town on the Tyrrhene sea, probably of Sybarite foundation, and afterwards, perhaps, involved with Siris in the ruin of that city 510 B.C.—a catastrophe not inconsistent with the dim record of a projected occupation of Sirite territory by Samian adventurers (cp. 7. 164 *supra*), which may have been an anticipation of the Athenian project: *Σάμιοι, πλεύσαντες εἰς Σύβαριν καὶ κατασχόντες τὴν Σιρῖτιν χώραν, περδίκων ἀναπτάντων καὶ ποιησάντων ψόφον, ἐκπλαγέντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἀπέπλευσαν*, Hegesander of Delphi *ap.* Athen. 656 = *Fr.* 44, Mueller iv. 421. The dream of an Ionian restoration at Siris was part of the heritage which Athens accepted in placing, or replacing, herself at the head of the Ionian race, after the fall of Miletos; but there shows no definite trace of an earlier connexion between Siris and Athens. The dream was not destined to be fulfilled. Thurioi was, indeed, founded in 443 B.C., but at a considerable distance from the Siris (330 stades, Strabo *l.c.*), nor was Thurioi a successful settlement from an Athenian point of view (cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* III. i. 518–541). Somewhat later, however (in 431 B.C.), Tarentum succeeded where Athens had failed: *Ταραντῖνοι τοὺς τὴν Σῖριν καλουμένην οἰκοῦντας μετοικίσαντες ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ ἰδίους προσθέντες οἰκήτορας, ἔκτισαν πόλιν τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Ἡράκλειαν.* The new city was founded on healthier ground than the old, but Siris remained the port (*χρόνῳ δὲ τῆς Ἡρακλείας ἐντεῦθεν οἰκισθείσης ὑπὸ Ταραντίνων, ἐπίνειον αὕτη τῶν Ἡρακλεωτῶν ὑπῆρξε*, Strabo *l.c.*);

τὴν ἐν Ἰταλίῃ, ἥ περ ἡμετέρη τε ἐστὶ ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἔτι, καὶ τὰ λόγια λέγει ὑπ' ἡμέων αὐτὴν δέειν κτισθῆναι· ὑμεῖς δὲ συμμάχων τοιῶνδε μουνωθέντες μεμνήσεσθε τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων."

63 *ταῦτα δὲ Θεμιστοκλέος λέγοντος ἀνεδιδάσκετο Εὐρυβιάδης· δοκέειν δέ μοι, ἀρρωδήσας μάλιστα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀνεδιδάσκετο, μή σφεας ἀπολίπωσι, ἤν πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἀγάγῃ τὰς νέας· ἀπολιπόντων γὰρ Ἀθηναίων οὐκέτι ἐγίνοντο ἀξιόμαχοι οἱ λοιποί. ταύτην δὲ αἱρέεται τὴν γνώμην, αὐτοῦ μένοντας διαναυμαχέειν.*

7 τέ ἐστι vulgo 8 δεῖ **B**: δέον Marc., *z* 9 τοιούτων P*z*
63. 1 *θεμιστοκλέους d*: Θεμιστοκλῆος *z* || Εὐρυβιάδης . . ἀνεδιδάσκετο om. R: ἀνεδιδάσκετο post. l. del. Cobet, van H. 3 *ἀνάγῃ* **B**: *ἀνάγῃ* Holder, van H. 4 *νῆας* **B***z* 5 δὴ S, Krueger: δὲ ὦν? Stein

though Pliny 3. 15. 3 seems to identify the two (*Heraclia, aliquando Siris vocitata*). Cp. F. Lenormant, *La Grand-Grèce* (1881) i. 201 ff.

8. **τὰ λόγια λέγει κτλ.**: the formula is noticeable, as the λόγια in question were no doubt in writing. This passage may fairly be taken as evidence of the antiquity of the idea at Athens of an extension or colonization in the West. To see in the speech of Themistokles, more or less fictitious though it be, nothing but the reflexion of ideas and discussions current in Athens about the date of the foundation of Thurioi is to ignore the points above adduced as antecedents of that very undertaking itself. There is also other sufficient evidence to connect the name of Themistokles with the conception of an expansive policy in the West; cp. Thucyd. 1. 136. 1, Plutarch *Themist.* 32 (names of his daughters, Italia, Sybaris). Busolt's defence of the claim of Themistokles in this connexion against the adverse critique of Beloch, *Hermes* 29 (1894), 604, concedes perhaps too much in sacrificing the antiquity of these λόγια and seeing in them mere products of the Θουριομάντεις. Athens had long been nursing commercial relations with the West (as Busolt well shows), and, moreover, Themistokles and the Athenians would probably have claimed as their own λόγια which in the first instance might have been intended to promote relations between the Ionians and the West (cp. 1. 94, 163–167, 170, 3. 136–138, 4. 152, 5. (42–47), 106, 6. 2, 21, 23–24, 7. 158, 163, 8. 22). Themistokles, if any man, was likely to have taken into account the Ionian precedents in the West. Whether he used any such threat upon this occasion, as is here fathered on him by Hdt., is another question. It would not have been easy to carry out, and the threat of joining the Mede would have been still more efficacious (cp. 9. 11). But the anecdote implies that Eurybiades and the Peloponnesians were on the point of withdrawing from Salamis, and this implication is hardly acceptable; cp. Appendix VI. § 1.

63. 1. **ἀνεδιδάσκετο Εὐρυβιάδης**: the verb has full middle force: 'allowed himself better instruction'—changed his mind (his instructions), 'was converted'; cp. 4. 95 (*ἀναδιδάσκειν*, to change the ideas, beliefs, of others). Materially it is important to observe that everything depended on the mind of Eurybiades.

2. **δοκέειν δέ μοι.** This expression of personal opinion and judgement by Hdt. is noticeable, especially for the reason given, that without the Athenians the Greeks would have been unable to resist the Persian successfully; cp. the still more elaborate statement of the same verdict, 7. 139 *supra*. Perhaps that passage is of later composition than this straightforward matter-of-course judgement here, though its simple directness might be ascribed to the very fact that a more elaborate statement and discussion has preceded.

4. **οὐκέτι ἐγίνοντο ἀξιόμαχοι**: i.e. *ἐγίνοντο οὐκέτι ἀξιόμαχοι*, and *ἐγίνοντο* = *ἔμελλον γίγνεσθαι*, or *γενήσεσθαι*.

5. **αὐτοῦ μένοντας διαναυμαχέειν.** This *γνώμη* involves two elements—(i.) *αὐτοῦ μένειν*, (ii.) *διαναυμαχέειν*. If the preceding narrative be correct there was

64 Οὕτω μὲν οἱ περὶ Σαλαμῖνα ἔπεσι ἀκροβολισάμενοι, ἐπείτε Εὐρυβιάδῃ ἔδοξε, αὐτοῦ παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς ναυμαχήσοντες. ἡμέρη τε ἐγίνετο καὶ ἅμα τῷ ἡλίῳ ἀνιόντι σεισμὸς ἐγένετο ἔν τε τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ. ἔδοξε δέ σφι εὔξασθαι τοῖσι θεοῖσι καὶ ἐπικαλέσασθαι τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμμάχους. ὡς δέ

64. 1 οὗτοι **B** 3 τε om. **B** || ἐγένετο z || ἐγίνετο B

no question about (ii.); the only question was where the battle was to take place: in which case, the decision now is simply *αὐτοῦ μένειν*, i.e. *αὐτοῦ διαναυμαχέειν*. But Mnesiphilos above has been allowed to point out that the two were one—if the Peloponnesians left Salamis no battle would be fought anywhere.

64. 1. ἔπεσι ἀκροβολισάμενοι: *nach solchem Wortgefecht*, Stein, who cps. *λόγων ὠθισμός* c. 78 *infra*. But there is a difference. *ὠθισμός* would be for the heavy-armed, *ἀκροβολισμός* would be for the light-armed orators. Moreover, an *ἔπος* is a 'winged-word.' The reference seems to be rather back to the *bon-mots* in cc. 59, 61 than to the weighty arguments of Themistokles in cc. 60, 61 f.

ἐπείτε Εὐρυβιάδῃ ἔδοξε: a decision by Eurybiades was all that was necessary; the Spartan navarch had absolute power in the matter, in virtue of the Spartan Hegemonia. He might consult a council of war, but he was not bound by a majority of votes, or even bound to put the question to the vote at all. Naturally, however, he could not give battle unless assured of the approval of the Athenians, who supplied two-thirds of the forces.

3. **ἡμέρη τε ἐγίνετο καί**: the *parataxis* is to be observed: not that the sunrise had of necessity anything to say to 'the earthquake on land and sea.' The earthquake is, however, surely portentous and Poseidonian. Seisms are unfortunately of no use chronologically; but the day in question is apparently the very day before the actual battle, the Persian fleet is all in sight, at Phaleron, albeit its arrival has still to be recorded in the story, cp. c. 66 *infra*. If the introduction of the anecdote in c. 65 as upon this day may be used for a chronological indication, conscious or unconscious, then the date would probably be Boëdromion 20; cp. *l.c.*

4. **ἔδοξε δέ σφι**: the Council again? or the Athenians? or, vaguely, the whole armament of the Greeks? A regrettable obscurity.

εὔξασθαι τοῖσι θεοῖσι: the day before the battle is largely devoted to religious exercises; the earthquake having probably emphasized the natural instinct of piety at such a crisis. The Athenians will have felt an especial grief in their exclusion from Eleusis on this day; but their prayers to the goddess were destined to obtain a rich response within the year, cp. 9. 101 *infra*. None of the gods was omitted from the litany on this occasion.

5. **ἐπικαλέσασθαι τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμμάχους**: Aiakos was a son of Zeus (*Il.* 21. 189 etc., but in Homer Aiakos is not yet descended into hell, as Judge of the Underworld). The best known sons of Aiakos are Peleus, the father of Achilles, and Telamon the father of Aias. From Aias were further descended the Philaidai, and Eurysakidai—two great Attic clans—through their eponyms, his sons, Philaios, Eurysakes. But Aiakos had also a son Phokos (Pausanias 2. 29. 7), whose tomb was shown in Aigina, where he had been slain by his half-brother Telamon, who was in consequence banished the island. Hence the Greeks, or Athenians, could invoke Telamon and Aias in Salamis (where they had resided), but had to send to Aigina itself to invoke, or to fetch, Aiakos and the other Aiakidai. But what others? For Peleus and for Achilles they would surely have had to send to their tombs in Thessaly (?), in the Troad (*Od.* 24. 80 ff.; Arrian, *Anab.* 1. 11. 12; cp. 5. 94 *supra*). The descendants of Phokos, too, were to be sought in 'Phokis,' Pausan. 2. 29. 2. (It seems as if Aiakos and Phokos were the only 'Aiakids' to be found in Aigina.) In view of the story in 5. 80, 81 it may fairly be argued that this ship was sent to fetch actual idols (*ξόανα*), and not merely to perform an invocation *in loco*; cp. my notes to *l.c.* This ship would have to evade the Persian fleet and look-out, though that

σφι ἔδοξε, καὶ ἐποίευν ταῦτα· εὐξάμενοι γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖσι θεοῖσι, αὐτόθεν μὲν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος Αἴαντά τε καὶ Τελαμῶνα ἐπεκαλέοντο, ἐπὶ δὲ Αἰακὸν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Αἰακίδας νέα ἀπέστελλον ἐς Αἴγιναν.

65 *Ἔφη δὲ Δίκαιος ὁ Θεοκύδεος, ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος φυγάς τε καὶ παρὰ Μήδοισι λόγιμος γενόμενος τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον, ἐπείτε ἐκείρετο ἡ Ἀττικὴ χώρη ὑπὸ τοῦ πεζοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ Ξέρξεω ἐοῦσα ἔρημος Ἀθηναίων, τυχεῖν τότε ἐὼν ἅμα Δημ-*

---

6 *ἐποίεον* **B** 7 *μὲν* om. **B** || *ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος* secl. van H. || *Αἴαντα τὸν Τελαμῶνος* S, Valla (ap. Gaisf.): *τε καὶ*: *τὸν* R: *τῶν* V (ap. Holder) 8 *νῆα* SVz: *νῆας* R **65.** 1 *Δικαῖος* z (bis) || *τε*: 'an *δὲ*?' van H.

---

necessity has not yet transpired in the narrative of Hdt.; it may therefore be surmised that it was sent at night, not in daylight. But, again, if so, it can hardly have gone and come in one night, but was probably sent out on the night preceding, and returned as recorded in c. 83 *infra*.

ὡς . . καί . .: a *parataxis*, but not a synchronism, and even an incorrect *parataxis*, seeing that either *ὡς* or *καί* is *de trop*; cp. *εἰ . . καί* c. 62 *supra*. The difference in the tenses **ἔδοξε, ἐποίευν** should be marked.

65. 1. ἔφη: the word might perfectly well be understood of a written authority or source, cp. 4. 13, 6. 137, and Introduction, § 10. Had Hdt. himself spoken face to face with his authority, he would have let his readers know it (cp. 9. 16), and if he were reporting simply a conversation with others he would scarcely have named one interlocutor without at least indicating the presence of the others. The words with which the anecdote, and the chapter, conclude, *ταῦτα μὲν Δίκαιος ὁ Θεοκύδεος ἔλεγε, Δημαρήτου τε καὶ ἄλλων μαρτύρων καταπτόμενος*, look more like an appeal to the *vox viva*, but are hardly conclusive in this respect, and certainly leave Hdt. himself out of audible range of Dikaios.

Δίκαιος ὁ Θεοκύδεος: doubtless a man of some importance in his day, presumably of the Peisistratid party (cp. cc. 52, 54 *supra*), and on friendly terms with Demaratos, as the ensuing anecdote proves. But the romantic hypothesis which P. Trautwein has woven out of these few indications plus general probability or possibility, making *The Memoirs of Dikaios* one of the principal sources used by Hdt. in his history of the Persian war, especially in those passages wherein Demaratos figures, is little more than a suggestive fancy. Sources, and written sources, Hdt. doubtless had; but alas! we can do little to identify or to reproduce them. Cp. Introduction, § 10.

The names 'Dikaios' and 'Theokydes' are rare, and almost unparalleled; but 'Thucydides' implies 'Thucydes' (*Θεοθου-κύδης*), and, if fancy is to be the order of the day, one might speculate upon a possible connexion between the father of Dikaios and the son of Oloros. What was the name of the father of Oloros, or Orolos? Considering the Thracian connexions of Thucydides, noting the extremely 'superior' manner in which he disposes of medism and the Median question, marking his tolerance of the Peisistratidai and the Tyrannis at Athens, one might amuse an idle half-hour in elaborating the conjecture that here, in this record of the unpatriotic rôle played by a more or less distant relative of his own, the Athenian historian and exile scented a provocation to the depreciatory estimate, both of the subject selected and the methods pursued, by his greatest literary predecessor, of whom he was obviously more than a little jealous! Cp. Thuc. 1. 20–23.

2. **Μήδοισι** rather suggests citation than free composition by Hdt. himself. Cp. c. 5 *supra*.

3. **ἐπείτε ἐκείρετο**: the imperfect has its proper force, but the statement seems less important chronologically than causally—as explaining how they came to be where they were.

4. **Δημαρήτῳ τῷ Λακεδαιμονίῳ**: cp. Bk. 7 *passim*. The description was hardly necessary at this stage in the

αρήτῳ τῷ Λακεδαιμονίῳ ἐν τῷ Θριασίῳ πεδίῳ, ἰδεῖν δὲ κονιορτὸν χωρέοντα ἀπ' Ἐλευσῖνος ὡς ἀνδρῶν μάλιστά κῃ τρισμυρίων, ἀποθωμάζειν τε σφέας τὸν κονιορτὸν ὅτεων κοτὲ εἴη ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πρόκατε φωνῆς ἀκούειν, καί οἱ φαίνεσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εἶναι τὸν μυστικὸν ἴακχον. εἶναι δ' ἀδαήμονα τῶν

6 *ἀπὸ* **B**, Holder || *κου* ABC 7 *ἀποθωμάζειν τε* ABC, Stein², (*τέ*) Holder, van H.: *ἀποθωϋμάζοντες* R: *ἀποθωϋμάζοντάς* S (Gaisf.): *ἀποθωυμάζον τέ* V: *ἀποθωυμάζειν τέ* (*σφεας*) Stein¹ || *σφέας* om. B: 'an transponendum post *ἰδεῖν δὲ*?' van H.

continuous story, and comes perhaps from the source. Did the Spartan exile recall his previous visit to Eleusis some thirty years before (5. 75)?

5. **ἐν τῷ Θριασίῳ πεδίῳ**: mentioned again 9. 7 *infra* by the Athenian envoy at Sparta as *τῆς γε ἡμετέρης ἐπιτηδεότατον μαχέσασθαι u.v.* How did Dikaios and Demaratos find themselves there? Had they come from Athens with a Persian column simply to ravage the plain? or were they on their way to Athens with the column which had left Boiotia by the pass of Dryos-Kephalai (cp. c. 50 *supra*)? or, as might seem most probable, were they crossing the Thriasian plain with the Persian force detached to move against the Isthmos, as recorded c. 70 *infra*? Or are they to be thought as there by themselves, and for no particular purpose, otherwise how could a cloud of dust surprise them? The Thriasian plain is a good size; it is a pity their exact position thereon is not more precisely defined.

6. **κονιορτὸν χωρέοντα ἀπ' Ἐλευσῖνος.** Did Hdt. suppose that the Pomp moved from Eleusis to Athens? K. O. Mueller accused him; Baehr defends, by invoking the N. or NW. wind! Surely the dust-cloud must move from Eleusis, because Persian fleet and Persian army are conceived, in the anecdote, as still to the east of Aigaleos.

ἀνδρῶν μάλιστά κῃ τρισμυρίων: this is the conventional number of Athenian citizens, cp. 5. 97, but the figure can hardly be used here with that reference, as the context clearly asserts that the festival was not confined to Athenians, while on the other hand all Athenian citizens were not initiate.

7. **ἀποθωμάζειν τε . . καὶ . . ἀκούειν,** 'they were not done wondering . . when they heard (were hearing)'; the *parataxis* has force. **πρόκατε**: c. 135 *infra*.

8. **ἀνθρώπων**: not the Persian army, nor yet the advancing Peloponnesians (they thought), nor any mortal beings. The doubt is whether it be not superhuman.

καί οἱ φ. τ. φ. εἶναι: Dikaios is not quite sure. If there is any truth in the anecdote (as seems probable) this Athenian exile, himself a *mystes*, may well have been in an excited frame of mind that evening, Boëdromion 20, that found him once more in his native land, under such unhallowed auspices, to assist on the morrow at the consummation of its ruin, or of his own eternal disgrace. Like the anecdote of Thersandros (9. 16), the story would suggest that there were those in the king's following who viewed with apprehension the struggle at close quarters with the Greeks, and were anything but confident of victory.

9. **τὸν μυστικὸν ἴακχον**: i.e. the cry 'Iakchos,' or the hymn in honour of 'Iakchos'—a specimen of which is perhaps presented by Aristoph. *Frogs*, 398–413, and which was uttered by the band of pilgrims as they went from Athens to Eleusis on the 19th or 20th Boëdromion; see further *infra*. The very day itself was also apparently known by the same name, Plutarch, *Camillus* 19. *Iakchos* may be etymologically a reduplicated form of Bakchos (*ϝιϝακχος*, cp. L. & S.), but, as M. Foucart points out (*l'Origine et la Nature des Mystères d'Eleusis*, 1895, p. 81), Iakchos was a late comer at Eleusis, and a subordinate personage; this very passage is the earliest evidence of his association with the mysteries.

ἀδαήμονα: an 'Epic' word, not used by Hdt. elsewhere. Stein suggests that it comes, with **σίνος** and **ἀρίδηλα** below, from Hdt.'s 'source'—a suggestion which further suggests that the source in question was in writing. How far this ignorance on the part of the Spartan

ἱρῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι γινομένων τὸν Δημάρητον, εἰρέσθαι τε αὐτὸν ὅ τι τὸ φθεγγόμενον εἴη τοῦτο. αὐτὸς δὲ εἰπεῖν "Δημάρητε, οὐκ ἔστι ὅκως οὐ μέγα τι σίνος ἔσται τῇ βασιλέος στρατιῇ· τάδε γὰρ ἀρίδηλα, ἐρήμου ἐούσης τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ὅτι θεῖον τὸ φθεγγόμενον, ἀπ' Ἐλευσῖνος ἰὸν ἐς τιμωρίην Ἀθηναίοισί τε καὶ τοῖσι συμμάχοισι. καὶ ἢν μέν γε κατασκήψῃ ἐς τὴν Πελοπόννησον, κίνδυνος αὐτῷ τε βασιλέι καὶ τῇ στρατιῇ τῇ ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ ἔσται, ἢν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς νέας τράπηται τὰς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι, τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν κινδυνεύσει βασιλεὺς ἀποβαλεῖν. τὴν δὲ ὁρτὴν ταύτην ἄγουσι Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνὰ πάντα

10 *ἱρῶν* BβAcorr., cp. c. 55 || *τε* om. β 11 *τοιοῦτον* β || *εἶπε* β : *εἶπαι* z 12 *σῖνος* PRz || *βασιλέως* C : *βασιλῆος* z 14 *ἀπὸ* β, Holder || *ἐὸν* βz 16 *βασιλεῖ* AB 17 *νῆας* βz 18 *ἀποβαλέειν* βz 19 *ἀνὰ* del. Kallenberg, Holder || *πᾶν ἔτος* maleb. Krueger, van H.

exile is assumed for dramatic purposes, it is hard to determine. But even if Demaratos is the mere vehicle of Herodotean didactics, it is obvious that Herodotus addresses an audience which had much to learn in regard to the *Eleusinia*. Such a public was hardly to be found in Athens. Whether the author himself was a *μύστης* does not appear, but, no doubt appropriately, the Athenian exile plays the part of divine or exegete, the Spartan that of politician or diplomat.

τῶν ἱρῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι γινομένων: in Hdt.'s own day, as in the times of Demaratos and Dikaios, of Peisistratos, and long before. There is surely no need to bring down this whole anecdote to the later draft of Hdt.'s work, or its revision—easily as the chapter might be an insertion—or to connect it merely with the attempted revival, or rather extension, of the Eleusinian Festival after the thirty years' truce, which was to be one of Perikles' consolations for the failure of his more violent attempts to make Athens the head of a great empire, or of his still earlier and more ingenuous plan to win pan-Hellenic recognition for his city by making it the focus of a pan-Hellenic Congress (Plutarch *Perik.* c. 17).

12. **οὐκ ἔστι ὅκως οὐ . . ἔσται**: there is here an omitted antecedent, and the ellipse, coupled with the double negation, serves to emphasize the assertion, in this case a prediction; cp. Xenoph. *Anab.* 2. 4. 3 *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως οὐκ ἐπιθήσεται ἡμῖν* (sc. *βασιλεύς*). **σῖνος** (neut.), an *ἅπαξ λ.* in Hdt., though the verb *σίνεσθαι* is to be found *passim* (esp. Bk. 9); cp. 1. 9 *supra*.

13. **στρατιῇ**, as the context proves, embraces both the land and sea forces.

ἀρίδηλα, 'absolutely clear'—also a *ἅπαξ λ.* in Hdt.; cp. 1. 9 *supra*.

14. **ἐς τιμωρίην**, assistance, aid, support—as often *ap.* Hdt. The prominence of 'the Athenians' betrays the origin of the anecdote.

15. **κατασκήψῃ**: for the verb cp. 7. 134, 137 *supra*, passages which would suggest that a *μῆνις* or *νέμεσις* was here too in view—although clearly not directed against the Greeks in Peloponnese or in Salamis. The word may be used in a weakened sense, meaning little more than the *τράπηται* just below. The grammatical subject is obscure; the nearest would be *τὸ φθεγγόμενον*, but, as that must be taken in the passive, the result is nonsense. Stein suggests *νέφος*, by anticipation; *κονιορτός* from above would be less remote and obscure; but a vague though self-evident subject, such as *τὸ θεῖον τοῦτο*, or such like, suggests itself in the immediate context, or even *τὸ σίνος τοῦτο, τὸ κακὸν τ.*

19. **τὴν δὲ ὁρτὴν ταύτην**: no feast or festival, strictly speaking, has been described, or even expressly mentioned, but may be taken as implied in *τὸν μυστικὸν ἴακχον supra*. The reference here is not to an *ἀγών*, which undoubtedly was held at Eleusis (in strict terminology *τὰ Ἐλευσίνια*), but to the celebration of the 'mysteries' (*τὰ με-*

ἔτεα τῇ Μητρὶ καὶ τῇ Κούρῃ, καὶ αὐτῶν τε ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων μυεῖται· καὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς ἀκούεις ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὁρτῇ ἰακχάζουσι." πρὸς ταῦτα εἰπεῖν Δημάρητον "σίγα τε καὶ μηδενὶ ἄλλῳ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον εἴπῃς· ἢν γάρ τοι ἐς βασιλέα ἀνενειχθῇ τὰ ἔπεα ταῦτα, ἀποβαλέεις τὴν κεφαλήν, καί σε οὔτε ἐγὼ δυνήσομαι ῥύσασθαι οὔτ' ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ εἷς. ἀλλ' ἔχ' ἥσυχος, περὶ δὲ στρατιῆς τῆσδε θεοῖσι μελήσει." τὸν μὲν δὴ ταῦτα παραινέειν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ κονιορτοῦ καὶ τῆς φωνῆς γενέσθαι νέφος καὶ μεταρσιωθὲν φέρεσθαι ἐπὶ Σαλαμῖνος ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

---

20 *τῇ δήμητρι* **B**: *τῇ Δήμητρι* Holder, van H. || *κούρηι* ACP: *κόρῃ* 21 *μυέεται* Stein[1] 22 *εἶπαι* z 24 *βασιλῆα* z || *ἀνενεχθῆι* B 26 *οὐδὲ εἷς* ABC: *οὐδείς* 27 *δὴ* om. **a**C || *ἐκ δὴ* z 28 *μετάρσιον ἀρθὲν* Cobet 29 *ἐς τὸ* **B**, Holder, van H.

γάλα), which took place annually in Boëdromion (15–23 ?), the 19th and 20th being especially devoted to the Iakchospomp, and the latter of the two known by his name. On the evening which began that calendar day the pilgrims reached Eleusis. During the daylight of the 19th they would have been marching from Athens, and it is, therefore, inferentially to the 19th that the conversation between Dikaios and Demaratos is to be dated, and consequently to the 20th that the actual battle is to be referred. Cp. generally, on the festival, etc., A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen* (1898), 179–277.

ἀνὰ πάντα ἔτεα: cp. 7. 106 *ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος*.

20. **τῇ Μητρὶ καὶ τῇ Κούρῃ**: the cult of the mother and the daughter, Demeter and Persephone, was presumably the original nucleus of the Eleusinian *τελεταί*, but not necessarily, like the *Thesmophoria*, confined to women (cp. 2. 171). The Homeric Hymn to Demeter bears no trace of the exclusion of men. The position of the other deities ('the god' and 'the goddess,' Eubulos, Pluton, Triptolemos, Dionysos) associated with the cult is obscure, but the supposed Egyptian origin of the mysteries (Foucart, *op. cit. supra*) looks like a retrogression in constructive criticism. At some early date, perhaps in connexion with the introduction of a new deity, perhaps as a consequence of the Athenian conquest of Eleusis, the cult obtained more catholic recognition, but the exact point at which 'pan-Hellenic' significance was given to the 'mysteries' is not clear; probably at least as early as the times of Peisistratos, with whose position and policy such ideas were congruous. Even in the age of Peisistratos the enlarged *Eleusinia* may have been represented as a restoration.

22. **ἰακχάζουσι**: sc. *ᾄδουσι* (*τὸν Ἴακχον*), cp. l. 9 *supra*.

23. **τὸν λόγον τοῦτον . . τὰ ἔπεα ταῦτα** appear to be used here as virtual equivalents; cp. Index *sub vv.*

24. **ἀνενειχθῇ**, 'be reported.'

26. **οὐδὲ εἷς**, 'no, not one!'—a somewhat false, but perhaps idiomatic emphasis; cp. 9. 80 *infra*.

ἔχ' ἥσυχος: an eminently idiomatic expression; Larcher cites Eurip. *Med.* 553, *Orest.* 1275 for the adjectival construction with *ἔχειν*.

στρατιῆς: as above, l. 13.

27. **θεοῖσι μελήσει**, 'the will of the gods be done.'

ἐκ: perhaps with a double force, material and temporal: 'out of the dust and after the voice'; for temporal *ἐκ* cp. 7. 188.

28. **μεταρσιωθέν** = *μετάρσιον γενόμενον*: *μετάρσιον* = *μετέωρον*, cp. 7. 188. But cp. App. Crit.

29. **ἐπί**: the uses with genitive (**Σαλαμῖνος**) and accusative (**τὸ στρατόπεδον**) illustrated. The cloud could not have reached the Hellenic laager without reaching Salamis. Apparently here the genitive denotes the more general direction, the accusative the more definite.

οὕτω δὴ αὐτοὺς μαθεῖν ὅτι τὸ ναυτικὸν τὸ Ξέρξεω ἀπολέεσθαι μέλλοι. ταῦτα μὲν Δίκαιος ὁ Θεοκύδεος ἔλεγε, Δημαρήτου τε καὶ ἄλλων μαρτύρων καταπτόμενος.

66 *Οἱ δὲ ἐς τὸν Ξέρξεω ναυτικὸν στρατὸν ταχθέντες, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ Τρηχῖνος θεησάμενοι τὸ τρῶμα τὸ Λακωνικὸν διέβησαν ἐς τὴν Ἱστιαίην, ἐπισχόντες ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἔπλεον δι᾽ Εὐρίπου, καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῃσι τρισὶ ἡμέρῃσι ἐγένοντο ἐν Φαλήρῳ. ὡς μὲν*

---

30 *δὴ* Stein², van H.: *δὲ* || *ἀπολέσθαι* **B** 31 *μέλλει*? Krueger (Marc.) || *τε* om. **a**C 32 *τῶν ἄλλων* **B** || *καθαπτόμενος* **a** **66.** 1 *δ᾽* **B** || *ξέρξεωι* B 3 *ἔπλωον* **B**z || *διὰ* **a**

---

30. **οὕτω δή κτλ.**: that this vision of the souls of the faithful celebrating a pan-Hellenic festival in a land occupied by the enemy portended aught but destruction to the barbarian, could not enter their minds!

31. **Δημαρήτου τε καὶ ἄλλων**: they were not then *tête-à-tête*; others were present to attest the truth of the story. Or did Dikaios disregard the injunctions of Demaratos, and communicate their adventure to other persons on returning to camp? **μαρτύρων** is of course used appositively; cp. note on *ἄλλος* c. 55 *supra*. **καταπτόμενος**: cp. 6. 88, *antestans*, *obtestans*, a purely Herodotean use; cp. L. & S.

This remarkable anecdote is framed in, so to speak, at the beginning and the end, by express reference to the source, the authority. It comes in strangely and out of place here, at the close of the account of events on the Greek side, and before the account of events on the Persian side, to which it might rather seem to belong; but (i.) the Persian army has already been introduced into Attica, cc. 50–55; (ii.) chronologically the event seems to belong to the very day reached in c. 64.

66. 1. **οἱ δὲ . . ταχθέντες**: cp. *οἱ δὲ Ἑλλήνων . . ταχθέντες* c. 1 *supra*. The narrative is here resumed from c. 25 *ad f.*

2. **τὸ τρῶμα τὸ Λακωνικόν**, 'the disaster to the Lakonians' they beheld in seeing the corpse-exhibition, c. 25 *supra*. The Thespians are not here taken any account of.

3. **ἐπισχόντες**: they 'halted,' or remained at rest, waited; cp. *ἐπισχών* 5. 16.

Six days are here accounted for, three of which are consumed by the further halt at Histiaia, and three by the voyage to Phaleron. These six days are in succession to two days accounted for in c. 25 *supra*, upon the second of which the naval forces were occupied in getting back to Histiaia, while the land-forces were getting under way on their march through Phokis and Boiotia to Athens. The previous day had been devoted to sight-seeing at Thermopylai; the day before that the king's fleet was occupied in advancing from Aphetai to Histiaia (c. 23 *supra*). Thus nine days in all are accounted for. The first of these nine days is the day immediately succeeding the fighting off Artemision, which occupies three days, exactly synchronizing *ex hypothesi* with the engagements at Thermopylai: adding these three days it would appear that the Persian fleet arrived at Phaleron on the twelfth day after its arrival at Aphetai, both events included. The fleet apparently finds the army in full possession of Athens, but what interval separated the arrival of army and of fleet Hdt. does not specify. If Xerxes occupied the Athenian Akropolis in less than a week after leaving Thermopylai, having in the meantime ravaged at least Phokis, and destroyed Plataiai and Thespiai, his advance was a tolerably rapid one. In fact, it is hardly credible. The log of the fleet may have been accurately preserved; but the arrival of fleet and army in Attica may have synchronized, the apparent interval being an illusion due to Hdt.'s method in separating the accounts of synchronous operations, and completing (relatively) the story of one series before entering on that of the other. He himself is here more concerned with the material mass than with the temporal motions of the forces. Cp. Appendix VI. § 2.

4. **ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν**: the construction

ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, οὐκ ἐλάσσονες ἐόντες ἀριθμὸν ἐσέβαλον ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας, κατά τε ἤπειρον καὶ τῇσι νηυσὶ ἀπικόμενοι, ἢ ἐπί τε Σηπιάδα ἀπίκοντο καὶ ἐς Θερμοπύλας· ἀντιθήσω γὰρ τοῖσί τε ὑπὸ τοῦ χειμῶνος αὐτῶν ἀπολομένοισι καὶ τοῖσι ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι καὶ τῇσι ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχίῃσι τούσδε τοὺς τότε οὔκω ἑπομένους βασιλέι, Μηλιέας καὶ Δωριέας καὶ Λοκροὺς καὶ Βοιωτοὺς πανστρατιῇ ἑπομένους πλὴν Θεσπιέων καὶ Πλαταιέων, καὶ μάλα Καρυστίους τε καὶ Ἀνδρίους καὶ Τηνίους

---

5 δοκέει S*z*, Cobet || ἐσέβαλλον C 6 ἀπικόμενοι om. **ß**, secl. van H. || ἐπεί *z* 10 Μηλιέας τε S, Gaisford, van H. 11 θεσπιέων τε CP*z*, Gaisford, van H.

---

is an *asyndeton*, there is no δέ corresponding to μέν, the infinitive is *pendens*. The judgement or calculation thus introduced by the historian and claimed as his own is not to his credit, being flatly contradicted by his own previous narrative, and in itself irrational. He judges the forces of Xerxes by sea and by land to have been as large, when they occupied Attica, before the battle of Salamis, as they had been at their arrival off Sepias and at Thermopylai. It is not quite clear, perhaps, whether Hdt. means to exclude the losses in the storm off the Magnesian shore (as Blakesley suggests); but even so, Blakesley finds it impossible to conceive Hdt.'s statement as "at all near the truth, unless enormous exaggeration is to be presumed in the accounts of the engagements off Artemision." But the more natural interpretation of this passage would refer it back to 7. 183 *supra*, where the barbarians ἐξανύουσι τῆς Μαγνησίης χώρης ἐπὶ Σηπιάδα—a statement at once followed by the grossly exaggerated estimate of the king's forces (7. 184–7), which is in itself one of the greatest stumbling-blocks in Hdt.'s historiography. His record of the Persian losses at sea since that point amount to upwards of 700 triremes: of his original total 1327, only about 600 remain at this point, according to the narrative, ἀξιόμαχοι. The notion that these enormous losses could have been made good by additions to the fleet between Artemision and Phaleron is patently absurd. The alternative presents itself: that the losses, and that the original numbers themselves, have been greatly exaggerated. But the navy-list, though not free from miscalculation, is perhaps approximately sound (cp. Appendix II. § 5). Hdt.'s purpose is obvious, to identify the navy-list for Salamis with the estimate and lists already given, and so to glorify the victory. He may have been encouraged by the fact that Aischylos had given, virtually, the maximum for Salamis. Hdt. not merely asserts that all losses had been made good, but also assumes that the whole fleet came to Phaleron. Probably on neither point is he correct.

The case of the army is not identical with that of the fleet. Losses had been lighter, and the supplements far greater. The Hellenic troops in the army of Mardonios are estimated at 50,000 (9. 32 *infra*). But Hdt. apparently makes no allowance, in the case of army or of fleet, for any guards or garrisons left *en route*, or for the ordinary wear and tear of warfare. He assumes that the whole land-forces of the king invaded Attica: that assumption, if true, would render more than ever incredible the gross exaggeration of his estimates, 7. 184 ff.

In any case the deliberate calculation of Hdt. in this passage, as in 7. 184 ff., shows that he takes himself seriously as a historian, precludes our treating him merely as an irresponsible *raconteur*, and goes far to justify the rigid application of *Sachkritik* to his methods and results.

10. **Μηλιέας . . Πλαταιέων**: on the Malians, Lokrians, Boiotians cp. 7. 132; on the Dorians 8. 31. For Thespiai and Plataiai, c. 50 *supra*.

12. **Καρυστίους**: the geographical position of Karystos is indicated in 4. 33 and 6. 99; the latter passage shows that the Karystians had in 490 B.C. resisted the 'barbarians,' though not successfully. An attempt was made

τε καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς νησιώτας πάντας, πλὴν τῶν πέντε πολίων τῶν ἐπεμνήσθημεν πρότερον τὰ οὐνόματα. ὅσῳ γὰρ δὴ προέβαινε ἐσωτέρω τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὁ Πέρσης, τοσούτῳ πλέω ἔθνεά οἱ εἵπετο.

67 *Ἐπεὶ ὦν ἀπίκατο ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας πάντες οὗτοι πλὴν Παρίων (Πάριοι δὲ ὑπολειφθέντες ἐν Κύθνῳ ἐκαραδόκεον τὸν πόλεμον κῇ ἀποβήσεται), οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ὡς ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὸ Φάληρον, ἐνθαῦτα κατέβη αὐτὸς Ξέρξης ἐπὶ τὰς νέας, ἐθέλων σφι συμμεῖξαί τε καὶ πυθέσθαι τῶν ἐπιπλεόντων τὰς γνώμας.*

13 *τε* post *Τηνίους* om. **a** 14 *ἐπεμνήσθην* **B**, Stein[1], Holder, van H. || *προσέβαινε(ν* V) **B***z* 15 *ἐσωτέρωι* **a** **67.** 1 *ἐπείτε*? van H. || *ἀπικέατο* P*z* : *ἀπίκετο* **B** || *οὗτοι* om. *z* 3 *ᾗ* **B** : *τῇ* *z* 4 *νῆας* **B***z* || *θέλων* **B** 5 *συμμεῖξαί* van H., Stein[3] : *συμμῖξαί* || *ἐπιπλωόντων* **B**

in 480 B.C. to punish them for their 'medism'; cp. c. 121 *infra*. They were afterwards subjected to Athens (cp. 9. 105), and assessed generally at five talents (cp. Hill, *Sources*, p. 91).

Ἀνδρίους: for the position of Andros cp. 4. 33, 5. 31. For the subsequent operations against it, cc. 108 ff. *infra*.

Τηνίους: for the position of Tenos cp. 4. 33, 6. 97; for the subsequent patriotism of Tenos and its reward, cc. 82 f. *infra*.

13. **τῶν πέντε πολίων**: not counting the Aiginetans or Euboian towns, six island states have been enumerated in the Greek navy-list (c. 46 *supra*), viz. Keos, Naxos, Kythnos, Seriphos, Siphnos, Melos; it is the first five, perhaps, which are here referred to (Stein understands Keos to be the one omitted). Paros also has to be excepted, c. 67.

14. **τῶν ἐπεμνήσθημεν πρότερον τὰ οὐνόματα**: the reference back is to c. 46 *supra*. The grammatical construction is remarkable; cp. 6. 136. But the accusatives, especially *οὐνόματα* here, might be taken as of reference or limit, rather than as directly objective.

προέβαινε ἐσωτέρω τῆς Ἑλλάδος: cp. c. 60 *supra* *προβήσονται ἑκαστέρω τῆς Ἀττικῆς*. 'Hellas' has here rather more the appearance of a geographical sense, even limited to the peninsula.

67. 1. **ἀπίκατο ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας**: corrected, both as to time and place, just below into *ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὸ Φάληρον*. The city-name might pass for the country, cp. 9. 17.

2. **Πάριοι** had paid dearly for Medism in 489 B.C.; cp. 6. 133–5. They now 'remained behind' (**ὑπολειφθέντες**, cp. 5. 61, 9. 53) in Kythnos—itself on the patriotic side, c. 46 *supra*—and like the Korkyreans in the west, **ἐκαραδόκεον τὸν π.**, cp. 7. 168. This attitude of the Parians seems to show—like the desertion of the Lemnian and the Tenian—that the islanders by no means regarded the triumph of the king as a foregone conclusion.

3. **οἱ δὲ λοιποί**: the *δέ* resumptive, after a parenthesis; cp. 7. 95 *tot. verb.*

τὸ Φάληρον, c. 66 *supra*. In 6. 116 it is described as 'at that time (490 B.C.) the Athenian arsenal (*ἐπίνειον*)'—perhaps because in the narrative there the remark is of especial point in view of the threatening pause of the Persian fleet in the offing; or perhaps because when Hdt. wrote that passage he had a personal acquaintance with the Attic harbours, which he still lacked when writing this, Introd. §§ 6, 7.

4. **κατέβη αὐτὸς Ξέρξης**: the king doubtless rode, or was driven down in his open chariot or closed carriage (cp. 7. 41 *supra*); he surely would not be walking from Athens. But it was an effort of condescension; for Xerxes might have summoned the council of war to Athens if he had merely wished to take advice. The king had not reviewed his fleet properly since Doriskos, or at least since Therme (cp. 7. 44, 100, 127).

5. **σφι**: not the ships, but the men, or their commanders. **τῶν ἐπιπλεόντων**: cp. 7. 98 *supra*. With **συμμεῖξαι** cp. c. 58 *supra*.

*ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπικόμενος προΐζετο, παρῆσαν μετάπεμπτοι οἱ τῶν
ἐθνέων τῶν σφετέρων τύραννοι καὶ ταξίαρχοι ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν,
καὶ ἵζοντο ὥς σφι βασιλεὺς ἑκάστῳ τιμὴν ἐδεδώκεε, πρῶτος
μὲν ὁ Σιδώνιος [βασιλεύς], μετὰ δὲ ὁ Τύριος, ἐπὶ δὲ ὦλλοι.
ὡς δὲ κόσμῳ ἐπεξῆς ἵζοντο, πέμψας Ξέρξης Μαρδόνιον εἰρώτα
ἀποπειρώμενος ἑκάστου, εἰ ναυμαχίην ποιέοιτο. ἐπεὶ δὲ περιιὼν* **68**
*εἰρώτα ὁ Μαρδόνιος ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ Σιδωνίου, οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι
κατὰ τὠυτὸ γνώμην ἐξεφέροντο κελεύοντες ναυμαχίην ποιέεσθαι,
Ἀρτεμισίη δὲ τάδε ἔφη. "εἰπεῖν μοι πρὸς βασιλέα, Μαρδόνιε,
ὡς ἐγὼ τάδε λέγω, οὔτε κακίστη γενομένη ἐν τῇσι ναυμαχίῃσι
τῇσι πρὸς Εὐβοίῃ οὔτε ἐλάχιστα ἀποδεξαμένη. δέσποτα, τὴν*

---

7 *ταξιάρχαι* R || *νηῶν* **β**z   8 *ἐδέδωκε* RS : *ἐδέσδωκε* V   9 *βασιλεὺς* Stein : del. Cobet, van H.   10 *ἠρώτα* CPz   11 *ποιοῖντο* **α** : *ποιέοιντο* C   **68.** 1 *ἐπείτε*? van H.   2 *μὲν δὴ* **β**, Holder, van H. || *ὦλλοι* **β**, Wesseling   3 *ἐπεφέροντο* **α**   4 *εἶπαι* z, van H. || *μοι* om. **β** || *βασιλῆα* z   5 *κακίστην γενομένην* **α**   6 *ἀποδεξαμένη* Pz : *ἀποδεξαμένην* **α**C : *προσδεξαμένη* **β** : *πωδεξαμένη* Marc. || *δέσποτα.* PRz || *τὴν δὲ* : *τήνδε* S, Reiske : *δὲ* del. Valckenaer, van H.

---

6. **προΐζετο** : *sedem altiorem, praecipuam, cepit* (occupabat ?), Baehr. The others *ἵζοντο*, just *infra*. Cp. 4. 88 *Δαρεῖον ἐν προεδρίῃ κατήμενον*, and 7. 44 —the *προεξέδρη* on which Xerxes sat (*ἵζετο*) at Abydos to review the fleet. Similarly *προκατιζόμενος* 5. 12, and the same word in the active 1. 14, 97.

ταξίαρχοι, as in 7. 99.

9. **ὁ Σιδώνιος [βασιλεύς]**: cp. App. Crit. Stein defends the *βασιλεύς* on account of the proximity of *ταξίαρχοι*, in which case *Σιδωνίων* would be more usual. Tetramnestos was his name, 7. 98 *supra*; the Tyrian's was Mapen, *ib.*

10. **Μαρδόνιον** : why is Mardonios, one of the six field-marshals (7. 82), thus employed on this occasion, when there were four admirals, including two 'of the blood,' who commanded the fleet (7. 97)? Blakesley replied that much greater confidence was placed in his strategic talents, and that he was perhaps regarded as the commander-in-chief of both services. But Xerxes himself surely occupies at present this position. Mardonios figures here perhaps for literary reasons, because he is one of the leading *dramatis personae*, and it is high time that something more were heard of him; he is needed as a foil to Artemisia; cp. cc. 100–102 *infra*. One must not take this council too seriously; the Persian admirals are conspicuous by their absence.

11. **ἀποπειρώμενος ἑκάστου**: cp. 6. 48.

68. 2. **οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι . . Ἀρτεμισίη δέ . .**: cp. 5. 36 *οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι πάντες γνώμην κατὰ τὠυτὸ ἐξεφέροντο κελεύοντες ἀπίστασθαι· Ἑκαταῖος δ' ὁ λογοποιός κτλ.* On Artemisia 7. 99 *supra*.

4. **τάδε ἔφη**, 'made the following speech.' The very words are given of the speech, and of a speech within the speech.

εἰπεῖν μοι, 'prythee, say!'—imper. infin. (cp. 7. 159 App. Crit.), and dativ. ethic.

Artemisia claims to have distinguished herself in the sea-fights off Euboia (Artemision!), of which claim the sources followed by Hdt. above apparently know nothing. He is here, doubtless, drawing upon his native traditions, and perhaps composing rather freely.

6. **τὴν δὲ ἐοῦσαν γνώμην**: the *δέ* is peculiar, but, as Stein explains, may be taken to express the antithesis between the real or genuine (*ἐοῦσαν*) opinion, which she expresses, and the unreal opinions given by the others. But the antithesis would be more pointed if it lay between the persons—Artemisia on the one side, the kings on the other—than between the opinions. How little **τυγχάνω** need connote of 'chance' is well

δὲ ἐοῦσαν γνώμην με δίκαιον ἐστὶ ἀποδείκνυσθαι, τὰ τυγχάνω φρονέουσα ἄριστα ἐς πρήγματα τὰ σά. καί τοι τάδε λέγω· φείδεο τῶν νεῶν μηδὲ ναυμαχίην ποιέο. οἱ γὰρ ἄνδρες τῶν σῶν [ἀνδρῶν] κρέσσονες τοσοῦτο εἰσὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν ὅσον ἄνδρες γυναικῶν. τί δὲ πάντως δέει σε ναυμαχίῃσι ἀνακινδυνεύειν; οὐκ ἔχεις μὲν τὰς Ἀθήνας, τῶν περ εἵνεκα ὁρμήθης στρατεύεσθαι, ἔχεις δὲ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα; ἐμποδὼν δέ τοι ἵσταται οὐδείς· οἳ δέ τοι ἀντέστησαν, ἀπήλλαξαν οὕτω ὡς κείνους ἔπρεπε. τῇ δὲ ἐγὼ δοκέω ἀποβήσεσθαι τὰ τῶν ἀντιπολέμων πρήγματα, τοῦτο φράσω. ἢν μὲν μὴ ἐπειχθῇς ναυμαχίην ποιεύμενος, ἀλλὰ τὰς νέας αὐτοῦ ἔχῃς πρὸς γῇ μένων ἢ καὶ προβαίνων ἐς τὴν Πελοπόννησον, εὐπετέως τοι δέσποτα χωρήσει τὰ νοέων ἐλήλυθας. οὐ γὰρ οἷοί τε πολλὸν χρόνον εἰσί τοι ἀντέχειν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀλλὰ σφέας διασκεδᾷς, κατὰ πόλις δὲ ἕκαστοι φεύξονται. οὔτε γὰρ σῖτος πάρα σφι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ταύτῃ, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, οὔτε αὐτοὺς οἰκός, ἢν σὺ ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἐλαύνῃς τὸν πεζὸν στρατόν, ἀτρεμιεῖν

9 *νηῶν* **B**P*z* || *ποίεε* **B**: *ποιέεο* *z* || *τοὶ, γὰρ* *z* 10 *ἀνδρῶν* secl. Stein[2] || *τοσοῦτό* **a**C, Stein[1], Holder, van H.: *τοσοῦτον* 11 *δεῖ* Holder, van H. 12 *εἵνεκεν* **B**, van H. || *ὡρμήθης* **B**, Stein[1] 14 *ἀνέστησαν*: *ἀντίσταται* **B** || *οὕτως* **B** 15 *ἐκείνοις* *z* || *δ'* **a**P*z* || *δοκέωι* B 17 *ποιεόμενος* **B** || *νῆας* **B***z* 18 *ἢ* om. **B** 21 *πόλις δὲ* **a**: *δὲ πόλις* P*z*: *πόλεις δὲ* C: *πόλιας δέ τοι* **B** || *σφι* Stein: *σφίσι* 22 *αὐτὸς* **B** 23 *ἐλαύνεις* R || *ἀτρεμέειν* **B**P*z*

illustrated by the context (it has as much affinity with *τέχνη* as with *τύχη*).

9. **οἱ γὰρ ἄνδρες . . γυναικῶν**: cp. 7. 210 *supra*, where something nearly as bad is said of the fighting on land, and c. 88 *infra*, where Xerxes remembers this shrewish *mot*, with a difference. Cp. 9. 107, which shows how bitter was the taunt even to the barbarian. In vilipending the fleet Artemisia apparently would make a silent exception for the Greek contingents! cp. l. 30 *infra*.

12. **ἔχεις μέν**, 'thou art in possession of . .' **ἔχῃς** just below, 'keep.'

τῶν περ . . στρατεύεσθαι: cp. 7. 4. Athens is the goal of the expedition. 'The rest of Hellas' was hardly to be included in the actual possessions of the king, so long as Peloponnesos, to say nothing of the West, remained.

15. **ἀντιπολέμων** = *ἀντιπολεμίων*: cp. 7. 236, 4. 134, 140.

18. **ἢ καὶ προβαίνων ἐς τὴν Πελοπόννησον.** Artemisia too is credited with the idea previously ascribed to Demaratos, 7. 235 *supra*, of an advance on the Peloponnesos, but with a difference: she appears to advocate a weak blockade of Salamis and an advance by the army (cp. below, *ἢν σὺ ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἐλαύνῃς τὸν πεζὸν στρατόν*). Such an advance, she argues, will dissipate and scatter the Hellenes—apparently that is the Hellenic fleet at Salamis, who are to be allowed and encouraged to break up *κατὰ πόλις*. They must be looking for a *ναυμαχίη*, as shortage of provisions would in any case compel them either to fight or to dissolve. 'Refuse battle by sea, push on by land,' is Artemisia's plan—a distinctly inferior plan to that ascribed to Demaratos *l.c.* Artemisia underrates the defensibility of the Isthmos, which, apart from naval cooperation, the Greeks could have held for ever; the gates into Peloponnesos were across the water; cp. 9. 9 *infra*.

τοὺς ἐκεῖθεν αὐτῶν ἥκοντας, οὐδέ σφι μελήσει πρὸ τῶν Ἀθηνέων ναυμαχέειν. ἢν δὲ αὐτίκα ἐπειχθῇς ναυμαχῆσαι, δειμαίνω μὴ ὁ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς κακωθεὶς τὸν πεζὸν προσδηλήσηται. πρὸς δὲ ὦ βασιλεῦ καὶ τόδε ἐς θυμὸν βάλευ, ὡς τοῖσι μὲν χρηστοῖσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων κακοὶ δοῦλοι φιλέουσι γίνεσθαι, τοῖσι δὲ κακοῖσι χρηστοί. σοὶ δὲ ἐόντι ἀρίστῳ ἀνδρῶν πάντων κακοὶ δοῦλοι εἰσί, οἳ ἐν συμμάχων λόγῳ λέγονται εἶναι ἐόντες Αἰγύπτιοί τε καὶ Κύπριοι καὶ Κίλικες καὶ Πάμφυλοι, τῶν ὄφελος ἐστὶ οὐδέν." ταῦτα λεγούσης πρὸς Μαρδόνιον, ὅσοι **69** μὲν ἦσαν εὔνοοι τῇ Ἀρτεμισίῃ, συμφορὴν ἐποιεῦντο τοὺς λόγους ὡς κακόν τι πεισομένης πρὸς βασιλέος, ὅτι οὐκ ἐᾷ ναυμαχίην ποιέεσθαι· οἳ δὲ ἀγεόμενοί τε καὶ φθονέοντες αὐτῇ, ἅτε ἐν πρώτοισι τετιμημένης διὰ πάντων τῶν συμμάχων,

24 οὐδὲ Stein[3] (fortuito?): *μελήσειν* van H. e Plutarch. Mor. 870 25 *ναυμαχῆσαι*: *ναυμαχέειν* **β** 26 *προσδηλήσεται* **α**: *προδηλήσεται* P: *προδηλήσηται* **β**z 27 *βαλέο* **α** 28 *φιλοῦσι* **α** 30 *δοῦλοί εἴσι* Az, Stein[1] || *ἐν* om. **β** || *εἶναι* om. **β** **69.** 2 *ἔσαν* z || *ἐποιέοντο* **β** 3 *βασιλῆος* z || *ἐᾶι* **α**: *ἐᾶ* **β**: *ἔα* Reiske, Holder, van H. 4 *ἀγεόμενοί* BCSV: *ἀγαιόμενοί* AR, Holder, van H. 5 *τετιμημένῃ* z

27. **ἐς θυμὸν βάλευ**: 7. 51. Cp. *Iliad* 1. 297. The aphorism which follows is not a very sound one; rather, one might say, 'Good masters (and still more good mistresses) make good servants.' If the slaves and subjects of Xerxes were indeed such as Artemisia described them, it was a condemnation of the master, of the system. Still more absurd is her converse: The better the master, the worse the slave! But is not Hdt. himself aware of all this? Is not the perverted aphorism, put into the mouth of Artemisia, a hit at the tyrant, and the *tyrannis*? Is there not a little malice at the woman's expense? The lines quoted by Wesseling from Naumachios *ap.* Stob. lxxi. p. 438 fin. are not identical in sentiment with the Herodotean, but rather a plea for the *via media*—

μήτε κακὴ δμώεσσι τεοῖς ἔσο· μήτε μάλ' ἐσθλὴ
φαίνεο· ῥηΐτεροι γὰρ ἀεί που πῆμα φέρονται.
θάρσεϊ δειδιότων μάλ' ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄνακτες.

30. **ἐν συμμάχων λόγῳ**: Artemisia apparently implies that the only persons deserving the honourable title of the king's allies were Hellenes—like herself. The non-Hellenic members of the fleet—Egyptians, Kyprians, Kilikians, Pamphylians—are born slaves, and naturally worthless for fighting purposes. But she does not venture so to taboo the Phoenicians. Mardonios amends her list, c. 100 *infra*.

According to the navy-list, 7. 89 ff., the Egyptians furnished 200 ships, the Kyprians 150, the Kilikians 100, the Pamphylians 30, a total of 480 ships. This might conceivably represent one squadron of the whole fleet, if it was divided *tripartito*; cp. 7. 97.

69. 1. **ταῦτα λεγούσης**: sc. *τῆς γυναικός*. She had her friends, and her enemies, as the context suggests.

2. **συμφορὴν ἐποιεῦντο**: cp. c. 100 *infra*, 5. 5.

3. **οὐκ ἐᾷ**: *vetabat, dissuadebat*; cp. cc. 36, 61 *supra*. The opt. (*ἐῴη*) would be in order here but less graphic and forcible.

5. **ἅτε . . τετιμημένης** below appears to be co-ordinate with *ὡς πεισομένης* above—the gen. abs. following a dat. (as often)—except that the one is a conjecture, the other a matter of fact; but had Hdt. written *τετιμημένῃ* it would (as Stein observes) have transformed the fact, alleged by the historian, merely into the motive experienced by her envious enemies. **ἀγεόμενοί τε καὶ φθονέοντες**: cp. 6. 61 *φθόνῳ καὶ ἄγῃ*

ἐτέρποντο τῇ ἀνακρίσι ὡς ἀπολεομένης αὐτῆς. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνηνείχθησαν αἱ γνῶμαι ἐς Ξέρξην, κάρτα τε ἥσθη τῇ γνώμῃ τῇ Ἀρτεμισίης, καὶ νομίζων ἔτι πρότερον σπουδαίην εἶναι τότε πολλῷ μᾶλλον αἴνεε. ὅμως δὲ τοῖσι πλέοσι πείθεσθαι ἐκέλευε, τάδε καταδόξας, πρὸς μὲν Εὐβοίῃ σφέας ἐθελοκακέειν ὡς οὐ παρεόντος αὐτοῦ, τότε δὲ αὐτὸς παρεσκεύαστο θεήσασθαι ναυμαχέοντας.

70 *Ἐπεὶ δὲ παρήγγελλον ἀναπλέειν, ἀνῆγον τὰς νέας ἐπὶ*

---

6 *ἀνακρίσει* **α** : *κρίσει* **β** : *κρίσι* Holder, van H. || *ἐπειδὴ* **β** : *ἐπείτε*? van H. 7 *ξέρξεα* **β**z || *τῆι ἀρτεμισίης* AB : *τῆς ἀρτεμισίης* 9 *πλείοσι* **β** 11 *παρεσκεύαστο* deleto, *θεήσεσθαι* pos. Naber, van H. **70.** 1 *ἐπειδὴ* **β**, Holder, van H. || *παρήγγελον* A[1]V : *παρήγγελλεν* (sic) Valckenaer, van H. || *ἀναπλώειν* **β**z || *νῆας* **β**z

---

χρεώμενος (Demaratos: was he among Artemisia's rivals here ?).

διὰ πάντων, as in c. 37 *supra*.

6. The meaning of **ἀνάκρισις**—*disceptatio*—appears to be guaranteed by *ἀνακρινομένους* 9. 56 *infra*, otherwise *ἀποκρίσι* or *κρίσι* might rather be expected here; cp. App. Crit.

8. **ἔτι πρότερον**, 'still earlier'—just as we say, *ἔτι* being used with any comparative, to strengthen it—and not necessarily = *ἤδη*, though no doubt *ἤδη* would give an excellent sense with the temporal adverb. **σπουδαίην**, sc. *τὴν γυναῖκα*.

10. **καταδόξας**, as in 3. 27.

ἐθελοκακέειν is imperfect.

ὡς οὐ παρεόντος αὐτοῦ, 'in his absence,' as matter of fact; a reason in Xerxes' mind, though not suggested as a reason which had been in their minds.

11. **τότε δέ**, 'but now'—**αὐτός**, though in the *oratio obliqua*—'he had made all preparations to see them fight at sea.'

παρεσκεύαστο: the pl.p. pass. in midd. or active sense is remarkable. Cp. App. Crit.

70. 1. **ἐπεὶ δὲ παρήγγελλον**: what interval, if any, intervened between the resolution of Xerxes to do battle and the *ἀνάπλοος* of the fleet, does not appear. The grammatical subject of *παρήγγελλον* is also obscure: is it *οἱ τῶν ἐθνέων τῶν σφετέρων τύραννοι καὶ ταξίαρχοι* of c. 67 *supra*, or is it not rather *οἱ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατηγοί* (7. 97)? Whatever it is, the subject of *ἀνῆγον* is different: those who issue and those who execute one and the same order cannot be identical. Hdt. apparently assumes that the whole fleet was together at Phaleron.

ἀνῆγον κτλ.: though *ἀνῆγον* is the imperfect, *παρεκρίθησαν διαταχθέντες* is a perfect aorist, and bars the assumption that the *ἀνάπλοος* was not accomplished: it was for *ναυμαχίην ποιήσασθαι* that daylight failed. The exact position, however, occupied by the fleet, when this *ἀνάπλοος* was carried out completely, is not clearly defined by the words *ἐπὶ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα*. Leake, followed by Grote, argued that the movement here described took the Persian ships right into the straits, and ended in their being drawn up in battle-array along the Attic shore, facing the Greeks in the bay of Salamis. That argument is in so far justified as it gives point to the statement immediately succeeding, *τότε μέν νυν . . ναυμαχίην ποιήσασθαι*, for this statement seems to imply that the Persians have reached a position in which they have it in their power to deliver an attack. Possibly Hdt. so conceived the situation (as far as he had any clear and distinct conception in the matter), but nevertheless Leake's theory cannot be correct or true to the facts. For reasons given elsewhere (cp. Appendix VI. § 3) it is incredible that the Persian fleet entered the straits by daylight and took up a position in order of battle opposite the Greeks in the bay of Salamis. Nor do the words of Hdt. in this passage, which no doubt reproduce what he had heard or read, of necessity imply any such absurdity. The Persian ships moved from Phaleron upon Salamis to attack the Greeks, and reached a position in battle-array; but whether that position was within or outside the straits is not expressly stated, nor is

τὴν Σαλαμῖνα καὶ παρεκρίθησαν διαταχθέντες κατ' ἡσυχίην. τότε μέν νυν οὐκ ἐξέχρησέ σφι ἡ ἡμέρη ναυμαχίην ποιήσασθαι· νὺξ γὰρ ἐπεγένετο· οἳ δὲ παρεσκευάζοντο ἐς τὴν ὑστεραίην. τοὺς δὲ Ἕλληνας εἶχε δέος τε καὶ ἀρρωδίη, οὐκ ἥκιστα δὲ τοὺς ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσου· ἀρρώδεον δέ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι κατήμενοι ὑπὲρ γῆς τῆς Ἀθηναίων ναυμαχέειν μέλλοιεν, νικηθέντες τε ἐν νήσῳ ἀπολαμφθέντες πολιορκήσονται, ἀπέντες

3 (ἐξήρκεσε ? van H.) || ποιέεσθαι z 4 τε γὰρ **B** || ἐγένετο Pz || εἰς B, Holder 8 ἀφέντες **a**

its orientation given. As the Persians were allowed to carry out this manœuvre without being disturbed, the inference would rather be that, as far as the movement went this day, it was all outside the straits.

2. **παρεκρίθησαν διαταχθέντες κατ' ἡσυχίην**: these words mean that they were allowed to take up a position, squadron by squadron, parallel to, or alongside of, some given line or object. On the *διάταξις* cp. 7. 34, 124, 178. In 9. 98 *infra* we have *πολλὸν δὲ πεζὸν παρακεκριμένον παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλόν*. The foot-soldiers are necessarily on land, but drawn up along-shore. In the present instance *παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλόν* is wanting; and even if it were supplied, the question would arise, what or which shore? The only indication of direction in this passage is in the words *ἐπὶ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα*—the *παράταξις* (so to speak) is *prima facie* *παρὰ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα*, or secondly *παρ' ἀλλήλους*—simply in parallel lines, the whole position being indefinite, but presumably outside the straits. If 'Salamis' with the article in Hdt. always denoted 'the town' as distinct from 'the island,' this passage would, indeed, carry them inside the straits; but no such canon obtains.

It is, however, quite possible that Hdt. has gone too far in reporting for this precise point the occupation of a position, wherever it was, by the Persian fleet, in battle-array; the *ἀνάπλοος* may have begun, but *παρεκρίθησαν διαταχθέντες* may be incorrect and premature. Or, again, the *διάταξις*, too, may have been complete, and the reason why no battle ensued may be, not that night descended on the Persians, but that the Greek fleet remained ensconced in the bay of Salamis, and would not respond to the challenge, or come out to do battle with the king's fleet in the open waters.

The precise day upon which the *ἀνάπλοος* took place and battle was offered, but not accepted, by the Greeks, is clearly the day before the actual battle, and as such would apparently coincide with the day in cc. 64, 65 *supra*, of the earthquake by sea and land, and the vision of Dikaios and Demaratos. If an earthquake really took place that morning, it speaks volumes for the courage of the Persians that they were prepared to go out to battle.

4. **οἳ δὲ παρεσκευάζοντο ἐς τὴν ὑστεραίην**: these words can hardly cover a return to land, and a fresh start, so to speak; rather the implication seems to be that the Persian fleet remained at sea. The *δέ* is associated with the grammatical subject, iterated for sake of emphasis (cp. 7. 50).

5. **τοὺς δὲ Ἕλληνας**: the scene shifts back to the Greek laager, the time is not changed, the day in c. 64 above coinciding with the day in this, but night has apparently fallen, and the tone of the narrative, the temper of the Greeks, is completely transformed! There they had decided to do battle (but not for a day or two, not until they can summon, or fetch, the Aiakids from Aigina!): here they are seized with fear and trembling.

6. **αὐτοὶ μέν**: the antithesis is indirectly supplied below by *τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων κτλ.* They were likely to be shut up in Salamis, while the Peloponnesos was being invaded by the land-forces of the Persians (Artemisia's plan, cp. c. 68). The sequence **μέλλοιεν—πολιορκήσονται—ἐπορεύετο** is observable. Stein takes the last sentence (**τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων κτλ.**) as simply explanatory of the words immediately preceding: other editors make it begin a new chapter or paragraph.

8. **νικηθέντες . . πολιορκήσονται**: cp. c. 49 *supra*, *εἰ νικηθέωσι τῇ ναυμαχίῃ*

τὴν ἑωυτῶν ἀφύλακτον. τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων ὁ πεζὸς ὑπὸ τὴν
71 *παρεοῦσαν νύκτα ἐπορεύετο ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον. καίτοι*
τὰ δυνατὰ πάντα ἐμεμηχάνητο ὅκως κατ' ἤπειρον μὴ ἐσβάλοιεν
οἱ βάρβαροι. ὡς γὰρ ἐπύθοντο τάχιστα Πελοποννήσιοι τοὺς
ἀμφὶ Λεωνίδην ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι τετελευτηκέναι, συνδραμόντες
ἐκ τῶν πολίων ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἵζοντο, καί σφι ἐπῆν στρατηγὸς
Κλεόμβροτος ὁ Ἀναξανδρίδεω, Λεωνίδεω δὲ ἀδελφεός. ἱζόμενοι

---

71. 2 *τὰ δυνατὰ* del. Krueger, van H. || *ἐμβάλοιεν* **β**: *ἐσβάλλοιεν* z 4 *λεωνίδεα* **β** 5 *τὲ ἐκ* **β** 6 *ὁ* om. **α**

ἐν Σαλαμῖνι μὲν ἐόντες πολιορκήσονται ἐν νήσῳ. The Greeks, in fact, are back in the state of mind before—or perhaps more truly just after—the capture of the Akropolis; the resolution of the preceding night goes for nothing. Artemisia, c. 68 *supra,* seems to deny the possibility of their standing a siege in the island, for lack of provision. There is no similar suggestion here. She, however, had advised the king to avoid battle at sea, and restrict his naval operations to a blockade. The Greeks anticipate a defeat.

9. **τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων . . ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον**: we must suppose this a fact, even if it is an element in their fear. Towards nightfall on the day on which the Persian fleet had moved up on Salamis, the Persian army was known to be on the march for the Isthmos, moving in the cool. The movement of the army must surely stand in some relation to the movement of the fleet; Artemisia had proposed it as an alternative (c. 68 *supra*).

Were Dikaios and Demaratos with this army, or army-column, when they had their vision, c. 65 *supra*?

Was there, in fact, any demonstration by land against the Peloponnesos? From Eleusis to the Isthmos was some thirty miles. Was some movement of the land-forces, designed to enable them to co-operate with the fleet in the impending battle, misinterpreted as an advance on the Peloponnese? Or is the march quite surely timed? Is it certain that it took place just on this day, and at nightfall? There is a considerable margin of possible error in this assertion. The comprehension of strategic movements and plans depends upon the nicest chronological accuracy of days and hours; and it is risky work reconstructing them from so casual and haphazard a writer as Hdt.

ὑπὸ τὴν παρεοῦσαν νύκτα, cp. 9. 58 *infra.*

71. 1. **καίτοι**, 'and yet'—they need not have been so mightily afraid, nor was their own country *ἀφύλακτος*—it had been rendered impregnable, as far as the land route was concerned: and they must have known it! There were three measures of defence: i. The *Σκιρωνὶς ὁδὸς* had been broken up and rendered impassable. ii. A wall had been built across the isthmus. iii. Just behind that wall was laagered a large army, under command of the Spartan Regent. Yes, *κατ' ἤπειρον* Peloponnese was safe. A movement of the Persian army in that direction could not have caused consternation in Salamis. Had the Persian fleet shown signs of moving in that direction there would have been more ground for apprehension; cp. c. 68 *supra.*

2. **ἐμεμηχάνητο**: the pluperfect here has its full temporal force, as also **τετελευτηκέναι** just below.

3. **ὡς . . τάχιστα**, 'as soon as ever' they knew the fate of Leonidas and his men. How soon would that have been? Long before the arrival of the Persian in Attica, and even before the arrival of the Greek fleet at Salamis. What follows might almost seem to be regarded by Hdt. as a spontaneous, and so fortuitous, concourse of armed men to the Isthmos: no doubt the movement was in response to Spartan command. But the army may have been under orders to mobilize, nay, may have been under way. Was not this the very force that should have been in Boiotia? Cp. c. 40 *supra.*

6. **Κλεόμβροτος ὁ Ἀναξανδρίδεω, Λεωνίδεω δὲ ἀδελφεός.** Not much can be made out of this notice under the head of Composition; see 7. 205 *supra.* The mere patronymic would prove little. Yet this passage may be

δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσθμῷ καὶ συγχώσαντες τὴν Σκιρωνίδα ὁδόν, μετὰ τοῦτο ὥς σφι ἔδοξε βουλευομένοισι, οἰκοδόμεον διὰ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ τεῖχος. ἅτε δὲ ἐουσέων μυριάδων πολλέων καὶ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐργαζομένου, ἤνετο τὸ ἔργον· καὶ γὰρ λίθοι καὶ πλίνθοι καὶ ξύλα καὶ φορμοὶ ψάμμου πλήρεες ἐσεφέροντο, καὶ ἐλίνυον οὐδένα χρόνον οἱ βοηθήσαντες ἐργαζόμενοι, οὔτε νυκτὸς οὔτε

---

7 *σκειρωνίδα* **B**, van H. 8 *ᾠκοδόμεον* z 9 *μυριάδων* ABP : *μυριαδέων* 10 *ἤνετο* A[1]B : *ἤρετο* C : *ἠνύετο* 11 *ἐσεφορέοντο* **B**, Holder, van H.

---

of older composition than the other, as it almost certainly is older than 5. 41. Why does not Hdt. add here that Kleombrotos was Regent for Pleistarchos? Cp. 9. 10 *infra*.

7. **τὴν Σκιρωνίδα ὁδόν**: between Megara and Krommyon, and so to the Isthmos; Strabo 391 *μετὰ δὴ Κρομμυῶνα ὑπερκεῖνται τῆς* †*Ἀττικῆς* <*ἀκτῆς*> *αἱ Σκειρωνίδες πέτραι πάροδον οὐκ ἀπολείπουσαι πρὸς θαλάττῃ· ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δ' ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἐπὶ Μεγάρων καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ· οὕτω δὲ σφόδρα πλησιάζει ταῖς πέτραις ἡ ὁδὸς ὥστε πολλαχοῦ καὶ παράκρημνός ἐστι διὰ τὸ ὑπερκείμενον ὄρος δυσβατόν τε καὶ ὑψηλόν*: Pausanias 1. 44. 7 (10) *τὴν δὲ ὀνομαζομένην ἀπὸ Σκίρωνος καὶ ἐς τόδε* (*ὁδὸν*) *Σκίρων, ἡνίκα Μεγαρεῦσιν ἐπολεμάρχει, πρῶτος, ὡς λέγουσιν, ἐποίησεν ἀνδράσιν ὁδεύειν εὐζώνοις. Ἀδριανὸς δὲ* [*ὁ*] *βασιλεὺς καὶ οὕτως, ὡς καὶ ἢν ἅρματα ἐναντία ἐλαύνηται, κατέστησεν εὐρυχωρῆ τε καὶ ἐπιτηδείαν εἶναι*. It is described as it existed in the middle of the last century, a proverbial Via Mala (*Kaki Skala*), in Curtius's *Peloponnesos* i. (1851), p. 9, when it was again a mere foot-path. But Hadrian can hardly have been absolutely the first to make it available for vehicles. Perhaps the Peloponnesians on this occasion were destroying a road adapted for wheels. The verb **συγχώσαντες** implies a made road or causeway. (*σκῖρος* perhaps means 'hard-rock.' Strabo 393 mentions *Σκιράς* among several old names for the island of Salamis; cp. c. 94 *infra*.) There went at least one (cp. Blakesley, Rawlinson), if not two, other roads (Curtius *l.c.*) through the Megarid to the Peloponnesos: the Skironian was the shortest, and, bad as it may have been, presumably the easiest.

8. **ὥς σφι ἔδοξε βουλευομένοισι** suggests a formal and deliberate plan, without precisely dating it. There was room for discussion: ought they not to have marched into Boiotia? Cp. c. 40 *supra*. They substitute the defence of the Peloponnesos for the defence of Attica.

οἰκοδόμεον διὰ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ τεῖχος. It was not finished for some time—not till the summer of 479 B.C., if we may trust 9. 8 *infra*. Blakesley remarks that the wall was not built at the narrowest point of the isthmus, but further south, from Lechaeum to Cenchreae (cp. Pausan. 7. 6. 7), "with a view of preventing a debarkation <immediately> in the rear of the defending force." E. Curtius, however, *Pelop.* i. 14, places the wall at the narrowest part; cp. below.

9. **μυριάδων πολλέων**: a vague but large estimate, which, if anywhere near the truth, makes it the more surprising that the work was still unfinished in the following summer; 9. 8 *infra*.

10. **ἤνετο**: from *ἄνω*, 'radic. form of *ἀνύω, ἀνύτω*'; cp. 7. 20 *supra*; *Il.* 18. 473 *ὅππως Ἥφαιστός τ' ἐθέλοι καὶ ἔργον ἄνοιτο*. The imperfect tense is here emphatic. The materials of the wall are remarkable. **λίθοι** for foundation; **πλίνθοι** for the superstructure; **ξύλα** for palisading, towers, etc.; **φορμοὶ ψάμμου**, either to be used for filling holes or the sand for making mortar.

The visible traces of building which still remain hardly go back to 480 B.C. The wall seems to have been rebuilt in 279 B.C. (Pausan. *l.c. supra*), as also by Valerian 253 A.D., and three centuries later by Justinian, and in modern times by the Venetians against the Turk; cp. Curtius *l.c.*; Baedeker's *Greece* (1889), p. 233. The line of wall is immediately south of the *Diolkos* (cp. Strabo 335).

11. **ἐλίνυον**: cp. 7. 56 *supra*.

72 ἡμέρης. οἱ δὲ βοηθήσαντες ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν πανδημὶ οἵδε ἦσαν Ἑλλήνων, Λακεδαιμόνιοί τε καὶ Ἀρκάδες πάντες καὶ Ἠλεῖοι καὶ Κορίνθιοι καὶ Σικυώνιοι καὶ Ἐπιδαύριοι καὶ Φλειάσιοι καὶ Τροιζήνιοι καὶ Ἑρμιονέες. οὗτοι μὲν ἦσαν οἱ βοηθήσαντες καὶ ὑπεραρρωδέοντες τῇ Ἑλλάδι κινδυνευούσῃ· τοῖσι δὲ

72. 1 βωθήσαντες **B**, van H. || πανδημὶ οἵδε Holder, van H.: πανδημεὶ οἵδε **a**: πανδημεὶ οἵδε Stein: πανδήμιοι δὲ **B** || ἔσαν z (bis) 2 καὶ πάντες RV 4 βωθήσαντες **B**, (ὑπεραρρωδέοντες καὶ βωθήσαντες, van H.)

72. 1. **οἱ δὲ βοηθήσαντες . . πανδημί**: evidently some great credit is taken for this *βοήθεια*: in six lines the title or term is used thrice, the effort is emphasized (*πανδημί*), the complete list of folks represented in the muster is given *nominatim*, the rest of the Peloponnesians are stigmatized for their indifference. Yet, in truth, what the Spartans and their allies deserved was a severe censure for broken pledges, and the selfish abandonment of Attica. This Isthmian wall was no credit to the Peloponnesians, and hardly consistent with Spartan principles (though they had used the wall at Thermopylai likewise, 7. 176 *supra*). The levy for Plataia was also *πανδημί*, i.e. the two-thirds, or all save *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* and *οἱ νεώτεροι*, and the figures for Plataia would give a total here of not less than 22,000 hoplites, while, of course, large masses of *ψιλοί* and of slaves would have been employed upon the actual building.

2. **Λακεδαιμόνιοι.** It is perhaps not to be assumed that Sparta sent as many men to the Isthmos in 480 B.C. as to Plataia in 479 B.C. (supposing the figures for the latter to be correct, 9. 28).

Ἀρκάδες πάντες. Tegea, Mantineia, Orchomenos would certainly be included—and probably other places. The phrase is remarkable, as though relative to a *κοινὸν τῶν Ἀρκάδων*. At Thermopylai the Arcadians are represented by 2120 men, 7. 202. But what of the medizers, c. 26 *supra*?

Ἠλεῖοι: no figure is given for their contingent at Plataia; cp. 9. 77 *infra*. They could number at least 1000 hoplites.

3. **Κορίνθιοι**, if they sent 5000 to Plataia, might certainly send 5000 to the Isthmos, though they have a squadron at Salamis, and had only sent 400 to Thermopylai; 7. 202.

Σικυώνιοι had at least fifteen ships at Salamis (cp. c. 43 *supra*), and sent 3000 hoplites to Plataia.

Ἐπιδαύριοι—like Korinth represented at Salamis, and by ten ships—sent but 800 hoplites to Plataia.

Φλειάσιοι have a Chiliad at Plataia in 479 B.C., but only 200 at Thermopylai, 7. 202 *supra*, and are unrepresented at Salamis.

4. **Τροιζήνιοι** have five ships at Salamis, and send 1000 men to Plataia next year.

Ἑρμιονέες have three ships at Salamis, and were to send 300 hoplites to Plataia.

This list of nine states named as sending contingents to the Isthmos is curious, and not on the face of it authoritative. The figures for each contingent are left to be inferred or conjectured; and, what is worse, there may be omissions in it. Were not the *Megarians* too, who had twenty ships at Salamis, and sent 3000 hoplites to Plataia in 479 B.C., also behind the wall? The order in which the contingents are named is odd, the Phleiasians at least curiously breaking into the geographical continuity.

5. **καὶ ὑπεραρρωδέοντες**: i.e. they are more afraid even than their fellow-citizens at Salamis! For themselves—or for the fleet? Only the latter would be to their credit: the fate of Hellas hung on the fleet. If so, the *βοήθεια* at the Isthmos must be conceived as intended to co-operate with the fleet: perhaps Kleombrotos is counting on the fleet falling back on the Isthmos.

τοῖσι δὲ ἄλ. Π. ἔμελε οὐδέν: a sentence which obviously betrays the apologetic purpose of the passage; it must be false, so far as the list is incomplete, and it is hardly likely to have been strictly true in any case—even of Argos, etc.

ἄλλοισι Πελοποννησίοισι ἔμελε οὐδέν. Ὀλύμπια δὲ καὶ
Κάρνεια παροιχώκεε ἤδη. οἰκέει δὲ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἔθνεα 73
ἑπτά, τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν δύο αὐτόχθονα ἐόντα κατὰ χώρην
ἵδρυται νῦν τε καὶ τὸ πάλαι [οἴκεον], Ἀρκάδες τε καὶ

6 ἔμελε P : ἔμελλε **α** (-ν **β**) 7 κάρνια **β**P 73. 2 τουτέων z || αὐτώχθενα B 3 τε : τῇ Schaefer, Stein[1], Holder, van H. : τὴν Koen || οἴκεον secl. Stein[2] (τε redintegrato) || τε om. z

6. **Ὀλύμπια . . Κάρνεια . . ἤδη** appears to be a clear reference back to 7. 206 *supra*, and a reference of a kind which could occur only in a work intended for a reading public. The passing of the festivals sets the Peloponnesians free to occupy the Isthmos πανδημί. But the story has advanced long past the Olympia: the 'night' in c. 70 *supra* is the night of Boëdromion 20. One might perhaps suppose with safety that as soon as the Olympia were over, certainly as soon as the news of the end of Leonidas reached Sparta, the move to the Isthmos was made — if, indeed, it was not rather a halt of the forces which were on their way into Central Greece, to support Leonidas (cp. 7. 203 *supra*), or to cover Attica (c. 40 *supra*).

73. 1. **ἔθνεα ἑπτά**: Hdt. gives the ethnography of the Peloponnesos, not its geographical divisions, which only partially coincide with the ethnography. Of the seven ἔθνεα therein, Hdt. regards two as autochthonous and in occupation of their original seats, viz. *Arkadians* and *Kynurians*; a third, the *Achaians*, as autochthonous, but migrant within the Peloponnese itself. The four others are immigrant, ἐπήλυδα, *Dorians*, *Aitolians*, *Dryopians*, *Lemnians*; see further the notes below. The Homeric Catalogue may be taken as recognizing six groups in Peloponnesos (*Il.* 2. 559–624): i. οἳ δ' Ἄργος τ' εἶχον κτλ. (559–568) = Argolis. ii. οἳ δὲ Μυκήνας εἶχον κτλ. (569–580) = Achaia. iii. οἳ δ' εἶχον κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα κτλ. (581–590) = Lakonia. iv. οἳ δὲ Πύλον κτλ. (591–602) = Messenia. v. οἳ δ' ἔχον Ἀρκαδίην κτλ. (603–614) = Arkadia. vi. οἳ δ' ἄρα Βουπράσιόν τε καὶ Ἤλιδα δῖαν ἔναιον κτλ. (615–624) = Elis. Thucyd. 1. 10. 2 may be understood to divide the Peloponnesos into five equal fractions, assigning two to the Spartans—a division which disregards ethnology and geography alike; unless, indeed, we are to read it in the light of Pausan. 5. 1. 1—a passage obviously composed in view of Thucydides: ὅσοι δὲ Ἑλλήνων Πελοποννήσου πέντε εἶναι μοίρας καὶ οὐ πλείονάς φασιν, ἀνάγκη σφᾶς ὁμολογεῖν, ὡς ἐν τῇ Ἀρκάδων οἰκοῦσιν Ἠλεῖοι καὶ Ἀρκάδες, δευτέρα δὲ Ἀχαιῶν, τρεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ ταύταις αἱ Δωριέων (sc. Messenia, Lakonia, Argolis. Thucydides, by the way, reckons Messenia as part of Lakonia, in accordance with the political situation in his own time, which clearly shows that his 'fifths' are arithmetical fractions, not geographical). Pausanias continues (with an obvious reference to this passage in Hdt.): γένη δὲ οἰκεῖ Πελοπόννησον Ἀρκάδες μὲν αὐτόχθονες καὶ Ἀχαιοί. καὶ οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ Δωριέων ἐκ τῆς σφετέρας ἀνέστησαν, οὐ μέντοι Πελοποννήσου γε ἐξεχώρησαν, ἀλλὰ ἐκβαλόντες Ἴωνας νέμονται τὸν Αἰγιαλὸν τὸ ἀρχαῖον, νῦν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν τούτων καλούμενον· οἱ δὲ Ἀρκάδες διατελοῦσιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐς τόδε τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἔχοντες. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἐπηλύδων ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων. Κορίνθιοι μὲν γὰρ οἱ νῦν . . Δρύοπες δὲ καὶ Δωριεῖς, οἱ μὲν ἐκ Παρνασοῦ, Δωριεῖς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Οἴτης ἐς Πελοπόννησόν εἰσιν ἀφιγμένοι. τοὺς Ἠλείους ἴσμεν ἐκ Καλυδῶνος διαβεβηκότας καὶ Αἰτωλίας τῆς ἄλλης. Pausanias then specifies — for the Hellenic period — Arkadians, Achaians, (Ionians), Dorians, Dryopians, Aitolians. (Could ϛ' or η' have dropped out after γένη δέ ?)

2. **κατὰ χώρην ἵδρυται** emphasizes the local fixity of the two autochthonous ἔθνεα specified.

3. **νῦν τε καὶ τὸ πάλαι**: the date of this 'Now' is unfortunately obscure; no doubt the remark would hold good of any day in Hdt.'s whole life, but the precise date of the composition of this chapter is a curiosity; cp. Introduction, § 9.

The passage contains five illustrations of the force of **τε καί** worth observing: here, (1) of the absolute continuity of past and present; just below, (2) of Arkadians and Kynurians, as belonging to one class, and further, (3) of Dorians

Κυνούριοι· ἓν δὲ ἔθνος τὸ Ἀχαιικὸν ἐκ μὲν Πελοποννήσου οὐκ ἐξεχώρησε, ἐκ μέντοι τῆς ἑωυτῶν, οἰκέει δὲ τὴν ἀλλοτρίην. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἔθνεα τῶν ἑπτὰ <τὰ> τέσσερα ἐπήλυδα ἐστί, Δωριέες τε καὶ Αἰτωλοὶ καὶ Δρύοπες καὶ Λήμνιοι· Δωριέων

---

4 *ἀχαιϊκὸν* A^{2}BP : *ἀχαϊκὸν* 6 <*τὰ*> Stein^3 || *τέσσαρα* CR 7 *καὶ Δωριέων* z

---

and Aitolians, who came in perhaps together, (4) of Hermion and Asine, cities of one folk, while (5) in 'the many famous cities' the conjunction is so close as to disappear altogether in our idiom.

Ἀρκάδες : to Hdt. the Arkadians are Pelasgians, cp. 1. 146, 2. 171, and *βαλανηφάγοι ἄνδρες ap. orac.* 1. 66. Tegea (1. 66 etc.), Mantineia (4. 161 etc.), Orchomenos (7. 202), Nonakris (6. 74), Pheneos (*ibid.*), Phigaleia (6. 83), Trapezûs (6. 127), Paion (*ibid.*), Dipaia (9. 35), and indirectly Stymphalos (6. 76), are mentioned among the cities of Arkadia. Arkadians are serving on the king's fleet from Kypros (7. 90), and perhaps as mercenaries in his army (c. 26 *supra*).

4. **Κυνούριοι,** described just below as Ionians, and nowhere else mentioned expressly by Hdt. Thuc. 4. 56. 2 enables us to identify their territory : *ἀφικνοῦνται ἐπὶ Θυρέαν, ἥ ἐστι μὲν τῆς Κυνουρίας γῆς καλουμένης μεθορία δὲ τῆς Ἀργείας καὶ Λακωνικῆς* : cp. 5. 14. 4, and 41. 2 *περὶ τῆς Κυνουρίας γῆς ἧς αἰεὶ πέρι διαφέρονται μεθορίας οὔσης (ἔχει δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ Θυρέαν καὶ Ἀνθήλην πόλιν, νέμονται δ' αὐτὴν Λακεδαιμόνιοι)*. The great chapter out of the *ἔρις περὶ χώρου καλεομένου Θυρέης* is told above 1. 82 ; of Kynurian Anthele Hdt. appears to know nothing ; and it is remarkable that in one place he speaks of Thyrea as the *χώρη* in debate. All this does not look as if he had knowledge of the operations in the district during the Archidamian war (424 B.C., Thuc. 4. 56, 57) or even of the settlement of the Aiginetans there after their expatriation in 431 B.C. (6. 91, Thuc. 2. 27. 2).

τὸ Ἀχαιικόν : what the strict ethnological relation of the Achaians to the Pelasgians (Arkadians) and Ionians of the Peloponnese Hdt. nowhere clearly indicates. Were they also (in his opinion) Pelasgians? Topographically he must place them south of their historic province, probably in Lakonia. Historic Achaia, with its Dodekapolis, had been Ionian before it was Achaian, according to Hdt. 1. 145. The relation of the 'Achaians' of Peloponnesos to the 'Achaians' of Thessaly is not a problem about which Hdt. concerns himself ; cp. 7. 196 *supra*.

ἐκ μὲν Πελοποννήσου οὐκ ἐξεχώρησε : is it possible that Hdt. did not trace the 'Achaian' settlements in Italy to the Peloponnesos? Or the 'Achaians' in Krete to the same source (*Od.* 19. 175)? Or does he merely mean by these words that the Achaian stock has not completely evacuated the Peloponnese, though it has shifted from one place to another within it? **τῆς ἑωυτῶν** : sc. historic Lakonia. **τὴν ἀλλοτρίην** : sc. historic Achaia.

7. **Δωριέες** : the legend of the Dorian invasion, or of 'the Return of the Herakleids,' is in part narrated 9. 26 *infra*, and everywhere presupposed in Hdt.; cp. c. 31 *supra*.

Αἰτωλοί : Hdt. apparently is acquainted with a form of the legend, which made Aitolians accompany or guide the Dorian invaders from 'Naupaktos' ; but he nowhere expressly refers to the legend of Oxylos (Pausan. 5. 3. 5).

Δρύοπες : the 'Dryopian' invasion of the Peloponnesos, which left its mark in Hermion and Asine, is doubtless conceived by the Greek historians as long prior to the Dorian, though it started, according to one story, from the same quarter or cradle (Strabo 434 *τὴν Δρυοπίδα τετράπολιν γεγονυῖάν ποτε καθάπερ καὶ τὴν Δωρίδα, μητρόπολιν δὲ τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ Δρυόπων νομιζομένην*). They had quarrelled with Herakles in their native Dryopis, and been banished by him to the South. (Diodoros 4. 37 ; Strabo, etc.) The geographical positions of the Dryopians in historical times (cp. c. 43 *supra*) suggests a sea-route for the migration—if, indeed, the whole legend be not a fiction, and the Dryopians of historic times fragments of a wide-spread stratum of early population. According to 'Aristotle' *ap.* Strabon. 373 Dryops was an Arkadian.

Λήμνιοι, evidently a consequence of the legend narrated 4. 145 ; but

μὲν πολλαί τε καὶ δόκιμοι πόλιες, Αἰτωλῶν δὲ Ἦλις μούνη, Δρυόπων δὲ Ἑρμιών τε καὶ Ἀσίνη ἡ πρὸς Καρδαμύλῃ τῇ Λακωνικῇ, Λημνίων δὲ Παρωρεῆται πάντες. οἱ δὲ Κυνούριοι αὐτόχθονες ἐόντες δοκέουσι μοῦνοι εἶναι Ἴωνες, ἐκδεδωρίευνται

---

8 *πόλις* **α**: *πόλεις* C 9 *ἑρμιων* A¹B: *ἑρμιῶν* R: *ἑρμηῶν* V: *ἑρμιώνη* A²C: *ἑρμιόνη* PSz 10 *παρωραιῆται* **β**(S ?) 11 *ἐκδεδωρίευνται* Pz: *ἐκ δὲ δωρίευνται* **β**: *ἐκδεδωριᾶται* **α**: *ἐκδεδωρίωνται* Valckenaer, van H.: *ἐκδεδωρίδαται* Dindorf

---

'Lemnian' is hardly an ethnic designation. Why does not Hdt. here call them *Minyai*? Does he expect his readers to have that passage in mind? And is this passage of later composition or insertion? (Cp. Introduction, § 9.) But see below.

8. **δόκιμοι πόλιες**: e.g. Sparta, Argos, Korinth, Sikyon, Phleiûs, Epidauros, Troizen, *et al.*

Ἦλις μούνη. This phrase can hardly be quoted (as by Blakesley) to prove that the passage is 'a later addition' to the work of Hdt., for even if Strabo 336 were right in saying that the city of Elis did not exist at the time of the Persian war, still it existed before any part of the work of Hdt. But Strabo probably overstates his case. Elis increased owing to a *συνοικισμός* shortly after the Persian war, Diodor. 11. 54. 1 (471 B.C.) (cp. 4. 148 *supra*), but there was a city of Elis already; cp. Homer, *Il.* 2. 615, cited above.

9. **Ἑρμιών**, cp. c. 43 *supra*, in the SE. of the Argolis peninsula. It was celebrated as the spot from which there was the shortest cut down to Hades. Strabo 373.

Ἀσίνη: the place here mentioned is on the east coast of Messenia, i.e. on the west side of the *Μεσσηνιακὸς κόλπος* (Strabo 359), not to be confused with the Asine in Lakonia, in the neighbourhood of Helos, visited by the Athenians in 424 B.C. (Thuc. 4. 54. 4), though possibly identical with the Asine mentioned in two other places in Thucydides (4. 13. 1, 6. 93. 3). It may have derived its name from an older settlement in close proximity to Hermion, *Il.* 2. 560, the inhabitants of which sided with the Spartans in the Messenian and Argive wars, and were expelled by the Argives, but given a new home by the Lakedaimonians, Strabo 373; Pausan. 2. 36. 4, 3. 7. 4.

ἡ πρὸς Καρδαμύλῃ: expressly to distinguish it from the one in Argolis, which, if still existing, was a mere village (Strabo *l.c.*). But has Hdt. correctly located it, or can *πρός* here mean 'opposite' 'over against'? Kardamyle was in the realm of Menelaos of old: *σημεῖον δέ· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ Μεσσηνιακοῦ κόλπου καὶ τοῦ συνεχοῦς Ἀσιναίου λεγομένου ἀπὸ τῆς Μεσσηνιακῆς Ἀσίνης αἱ ἑπτὰ ἦσαν πόλεις, ἃς ὑπέσχετο δώσειν ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ "Καρδαμύλην Ἐνόπην τε κτλ."* (*Il.* 9. 150, 295) Strabo 359. Bursian (ii. 154) describes it as situate about 5 miles (*zwei Stunden*) N. of Leuktra, and 1 mile (20 min.) from the coast, upon a steep rock, the village still preserving the name, *Skardamyla.*

τῇ Λακωνικῇ: to distinguish it from any other place of the same name, e.g. the city on Chios mentioned by Thucyd. 8. 24. 3.

10. **Παρωρεῆται**: according to 4. 148 the 'Paroreatai' and 'Kaukones' had been driven out of their cities by the Minyai (i.e. the Lemnians); here Hdt. appears to identify the Paroreatai with the Lemnians (i.e. Minyai) or with a part of them. The two passages must be regarded as independent, even though the Lemnian legend underlies this one. The two peoples stood on the same ground. Strabo 346 *ἐλέγοντο δὲ Παρωρεᾶται τινὲς τῶν ἐν τῇ Τριφυλίᾳ κατέχοντες ὄρη περὶ τὸ Λέπρειον καὶ τὸ Μάκιστον καθήκοντα ἐπὶ θάλατταν πλησίον τοῦ Σαμιακοῦ ποσειδίου.* The name no doubt means the inhabitants of the *Παρωρεία*, which means 'the Highland'—though why L. & S. place this particular Paroreia in 'Arcadia,' unless by confusion with the town mentioned by Pausanias 8. 27. 3, is not obvious. The name is found in Thrace (Livy 39. 27) and even on the Euxine (*C.I.G.* 2058, B 17).

11. **μοῦνοι εἶναι Ἴωνες**: Hdt. appears to think that the 'Kynurians' were Ionians, and the only Ionians remaining in the Peloponnesos. As they occupy their original abode, he must conceive

δὲ ὑπό τε Ἀργείων ἀρχόμενοι καὶ τοῦ χρόνου, ἐόντες Ὀρνεῆται [καὶ οἱ περίοικοι]. τούτων ὦν τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐθνέων αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλιες, πάρεξ τῶν κατέλεξα, ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατέατο· εἰ δὲ ἐλευθέρως ἔξεστι εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι ἐμήδιζον.

74 Οἱ μὲν δὴ ἐν τῷ Ἰσθμῷ τοιούτῳ πόνῳ συνέστασαν ἅτε περὶ τοῦ παντὸς ἤδη [δρόμου] θέοντες καὶ τῇσι νηυσὶ οὐκ

---

12 *ἀρχόμενοι* del. Cobet, van H. || *καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ* (participio retento) Schaefer, Krueger || *χρόνου* <*προιόντος*> Stein[3] || *ὀρνεᾶται* **a** 13 *καὶ οἱ περίοικοι* secl. Stein[2]: *οἱ* om. **B**: verba *ἐόντες . . περίοικοι* mihi suspecta || *τουτέων* **B**Pz 14 *πόλις* **a**: *πόλεις* C || *ἐκαθέατο* **a**: *ἐκατέατο* **B** 15 *εἶπαι* z, van H. 74. 2 *δρόμου* del. Lobeck: an *δρόμον*?

---

the Ionians as originally occupying more ground in the Peloponnesos than the historic Achaia.

ἐκδεδωρίευνται, 'they have become' more Dorian than the Dorians, or, at least, 'thoroughly dorized.' Cp. App. Crit. But what to Hdt. were the notes of Dorism, apart from descent?—dialect, 1. 139; dress, 5. 88; organization, 5. 68; perhaps cult, 5. 72. It is, indeed, curious how little there is to distinguish the Dorians as such; but of course to Hdt. they are the Ἕλληνες κατ' ἐξοχήν: cp. 1. 56, 5. 88, 7. 93 etc. At the time Hdt. wrote this passage Thyrea can hardly yet have been in the hands of the Aiginetans; in other words, it makes against the theory of the late composition of Bks. 7–9 (cp. Introduction, § 9), and even against dating the composition, or insertion, of this chapter to the final revision (*ibid.* § 10).

12. **ὑπό τε Ἀργείων ἀρχόμενοι καὶ τοῦ χ.**: the participle is exegetical, after Argives. **χρόνου** is in direct regimen from the preposition, 'by their subjection to the Argives and by lapse of time.' Stein's last lection (cp. App. Crit.), reducing the construction to a simple *genit. absol.*, waters down a forcible phrase.

Ὀρνεῆται: Orneai is known to the Homeric Catalogue, *Il.* 2. 571, in the Mykenaian (or Achaian) group (cp. 1. 1 *supra*); it certainly was not in Kynuria; cp. Strabo 376, Pausan. 2. 25. 5. If this whole phrase be not (as I suspect) a gloss (cp. App. Crit.), it must be inferred, with K. O. Müller (*Dorier*[2] i. 85, 160, etc.), that Orneai had been reduced by Argos before the Persian war, or at least before the date of Hdt.'s composition, and that, like the *Caerites* at Rome, the Orneatai gave their name to a political status—resembling that of the *perioikoi* in Laconia.

At the battle of Mantineia in 418 B.C. the Orneatai are described, with the Kleonaians, as ξύμμαχοι of the Argives (Thuc. 5. 67. 2), and the reduction and destruction of Orneai is recorded later, in 415 B.C. (Thuc. 6. 7. 2). The city was at that time occupied by Argive exiles, supported by a Lakedaimonian garrison (Diodor. 12. 81. 4).

14. **πάρεξ τῶν κατέλεξα**: the construction is by attraction. The phrase, remarkable as a reference back to c. 72, might perhaps support the view that c. 73 is a later insertion from the author's hand; or would not Hdt. have used the perfect rather than the aorist if cc. 72–73 had been originally written *in einem Flug*?

εἰ δὲ ἐλευθέρως ἔξεστι εἰπεῖν. Why should there be any difficulty about free speech, free writing? Hdt. has an audience, or a reading public in view, which may be offended by his verdict. Is that public found in the 'Achaian' colonies of Italy? Or in Athens, at a time when the alliance with Argos, with Achaia, might be 'in the air'? The ethnography of the Peloponnesos might have had special interest for either public.

15. **ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι ἐμήδιζον.** This verdict appears much more severe than the apology for the Argives in 7. 152 *supra*, and might well belong to a different stratum, a different draft, in the composition of the work.

74. 1. **πόνῳ συνέστασαν**: cp. λιμῷ συνεστεῶτας 7. 170, and ἔχοντι δέ οἱ τοῦτον τὸν πόνον 1. 206. Baehr observes that συνέστασαν is *plus-quam perfectum* in sense, and compares κατέστησαν 2. 30.

2. **περὶ . . θέοντες**: cp. 7. 57 περὶ

ἐλπίζοντες ἐλλάμψεσθαι· οἱ δὲ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ὅμως ταῦτα πυνθανόμενοι ἀρρώδεον, οὐκ οὕτω περὶ σφίσι αὐτοῖσι δειμαίνοντες ὡς περὶ τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ. τέως μὲν δὴ αὐτῶν ἀνὴρ ἀνδρὶ παραστὰς σιγῇ λόγον ἐποιέετο, θῶμα ποιεύμενοι τὴν Εὐρυβιάδεω ἀβουλίην· τέλος δὲ ἐξερράγη ἐς τὸ μέσον. σύλλογός τε δὴ ἐγίνετο καὶ πολλὰ ἐλέγετο περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, οἱ μὲν ὡς ἐς τὴν Πελοπόννησον χρεὸν εἴη ἀποπλέειν καὶ περὶ ἐκείνης κινδυνεύειν μηδὲ πρὸ χώρης δοριαλώτου μένοντας

---

3 ἐλλάμψεσθαι CP: ἐλάμψεσθαι *z*: ἐνλάμψεσθαι || σαλαμῖνι ἕλληνες **B***z* || πυνθανόμενοι ταῦτα **B** 5 πελοπονήσω **B**(?) || τέως Reiske: ἕως || αὐτέων *z* 6 θῶυμα P*z*, Stein[1] || ποιεύμενος *z*: ποιεόμενος **B** 8 αὐτέων *z* 9 χρεὼν CP*dz* || ἀποπλώειν **B***z*, van H. 10 δορυαλάτου *z*

ἑωυτοῦ τρέχων. *δρόμον* might be better than *δρόμου*; cp. App. Crit.

τῇσι ν. οὐκ ἐλπ. ἐλλάμψεσθαι, 'having no hope (expectation) of success (glory) at sea.' Cp. 1. 80 *τὸ ἱππικόν, τῷ δή τι καὶ ἐπεῖχε ἐλλάμψεσθαι ὁ Λυδός*. But this despair at the Isthmos is unworthy (i.) of the previous record and present position of the fleet; (ii.) of the plan to co-operate therewith; (iii.) of the misgivings on the other side—probably not unknown to the Greeks. Moreover, strategically, it involves an absurdity, for unless the Greek fleet could hold its own against the Persian, the wall at the Isthmos would be worse than useless.

3. **οἱ δὲ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι**: the scene shifts back to the time and place of c. 70 *supra*, but the temper of the Greeks at Salamis is changed; there they were nervous on their own account, primarily anticipating defeat and blockade in Salamis, while Peloponnese was left exposed. Now, on hearing of the wall, the army, and all (*ταῦτα πυνθανόμενοι*), they drop their selfish fears and are terror-struck (*ἀρρώδεον*, cp. c. 72 and c. 70) on account of the Peloponnesos! This argument and motivation is not very good. The **ταῦτα** might, perhaps, be referred, or made to include, the medism in the Peloponnesos—but that was hardly news (*πυνθανόμενοι*) to them; and in any case the point remains that 'the Greeks' are not really afraid of the result of a naval battle, but wish to win it at the Isthmos.

5 ff. **τέως μὲν δή**, 'for a while'—there was only silent, or at least private, criticism (**σιγῇ λόγον ἐποιέετο**), one man to another, all expressing their astonishment at the folly of Eurybiades: at last (**τέλος δέ**) they could stand it no longer—things came to a head—the storm burst openly—a meeting came together, and the whole question was opened afresh. (**ἐξερράγη**, app. impers.; and cp. 3. 133 of a tumour (*φῦμα . . ἐκραγέν*) and 6. 129 *ἐκραγῆναι ἔς τινα*. **ἐς τὸ μέσον**, cp. 7. 152.)

Very graphic, but not quite coherent. Is this in the night which has come over the scene in c. 70 *supra*? The men are plainly ashore. Who are the actors, or speakers? The general body of *Epibatai*, or only the *Strategoi*? Is the **σύλλογος** a public meeting (cp. c. 83 *infra*), or is it the *Synedrion*? These points are not clear in the story, or in the mind of the historian.

8. **περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν** is rather obscure and clumsy, even if a reference back to the discussion reported cc. 59–63.

9. **οἱ μέν**: sc. *λέγοντες*, as though *ἔλεγον* had immediately preceded; *const. ad sensum.*

These would be the Korinthians, and perhaps Sikyonians, Epidaurians, etc. They treat the *ἀπόπλοος* as still completely open to them. This could not be the case if the Persian fleet had, in c. 70, entered the straits and taken up a position facing the bay of Salamis. This party is prepared to fight, but proposes to change the venue.

10. **περὶ . . πρό**: the prepositions have both local and causal force.

δοριαλώτου: cp. 9. 4. The word looks poetical but is found in Xenophon and orators; cp. *ἡ αἰχμή* 7. 152 *supra*.

μάχεσθαι, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ καὶ Αἰγινῆται καὶ Μεγαρέες αὐτοῦ
75 μένοντας ἀμύνεσθαι. ἐνθαῦτα Θεμιστοκλέης ὡς ἑσσοῦτο τῇ
γνώμῃ ὑπὸ τῶν Πελοποννησίων, λαθὼν ἐξέρχεται ἐκ τοῦ

11 δὲ : τε **B** 12 μένοντες **B** || ἀμυνέεσθαι R : ἀμύνασθαι z

12. **ἀμύνεσθαι** rather suggests, though not quite conclusively, that they expect attack and are prepared to act on the defensive. The Athenians, Aiginetans, Megarians have a common interest, and pull together; cp. c. 60 *supra*.

75. 1. **Θεμιστοκλέης ὡς ἑσσοῦτο τῇ γνώμῃ**: a strange phrase to be used of Themistokles! cp. 9. 122 *infra*. Themistokles surely had much the best of the argument, cp. c. 60 *supra*; and he is backed by the Aiginetans and Megarians. The phrase is, indeed, a concession to the necessities of the false tradition, which represents the Peloponnesians as resolved, at all costs, to abandon Salamis. But ἑσσοῦτο (i.q. ἡσσᾶτο) is of course imperfect, and therefore, perhaps, not quite conclusive.

2. **λαθὼν ἐξέρχεται ἐκ τ. συνεδρίου.** This is plainly a meeting of the Strategoi (cp. c. 78 *infra*), and it would be at least the third recorded in Hdt. (cp. cc. 49-56, 59-64 *supra*). It is apparently being holden at night—like the previous one!—and the night would be Boëdromion 20 (by Attic reckoning; cp. c. 65. 19), on which the Persian army was reported or believed to be moving ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον, c. 70 *supra*, while the Persian fleet had been manœuvring all, or most of the day previous, with a view to bringing about a battle: *ibid.* These manœuvres, these movements, may well have given rise to fresh debate among the Greek Strategoi. The question would be, whether to assume the offensive, or to await attack: and if the offensive was to be assumed (as at Artemision, cp. c. 9 *supra*), at what particular point: were the Greeks to advance right out of the straits—as the Persians appeared to desire—and to encounter the king's fleet in comparatively open water? Or were they to allow, or to induce, the Persian admirals to enter the narrow waters, and to expose themselves, in entering, to a flank attack?

It is possible that the Peloponnesians were prepared to go out into the open waters: the move to the Isthmos, the selection of the open water there as the scene of the engagement which (all agreed) had to be fought somewhere, might almost justify the suspicion that the Peloponnesians were now advocating an advance against the Persian fleet in the open waters to the S. of Salamis. But such an hypothesis were rash. To fight in the open water off the Isthmos, the bay of Kenchreai, with the Peloponnesos immediately in the rear to fall back upon, is one thing; but in the open water off Salamis, another. The risk of being shut up and besieged in Salamis was, indeed, not in that case inevitable; they might make good their escape, if needs were, to the Peloponnese; but still, with difficulty, and not without risk of being surrounded and cut off, which would not be possible, in the bay of Kenchreai.

To fight at Salamis, and in the narrow waters between Salamis and the Attic shore, was clearly the plan of Themistokles. But to procure the realization of this plan, the Persian fleet should enter the straits; and it had not yet done so (cp. c. 70 *supra*). His problem was to bring that movement about. The Persians presumably wished to fight in the open waters off Salamis: some of the Peloponnesians perhaps preferred to fight in the less open, but also less confined, waters of the bay of Kenchreai.

But the plan of Themistokles had been already endorsed and adopted. The movement of the Persian army towards the Peloponnese (if it really was moving thitherwards) could not affect that plan. What did affect it was the clear perception that the Persian admirals had apparently no intention of entering the straits: how, indeed, could they venture to do so, with the Greek fleet drawn up in the bay of Salamis, ready to charge them in flank? A debate might very well arise among the Greek Strategoi as to the means of inducing the Persian fleet to enter the channel. Such a debate once started, the previous question may possibly have been raised again, as to whether the Greek fleet had not better make for the Isthmos. A battle had to be fought somewhere. If the Persians would not fight in closed waters, the battle must

συνεδρίου, ἐξελθὼν δὲ πέμπει ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Μήδων ἄνδρα πλοίῳ ἐντειλάμενος τὰ λέγειν χρεόν, τῷ οὔνομα μὲν ἦν Σίκιννος, οἰκέτης δὲ καὶ παιδαγωγὸς ἦν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος παίδων· τὸν δὴ ὕστερον τούτων τῶν πρηγμάτων Θεμιστοκλέης

---

75. 4 *χρεὸν* **α**: *χρῆν* **β**: *χρεὼν* 5 *σίκυννος* C: *σίκινος* **β***z* || *θεμιστοκλούς* R: *θεμιστοκλέους* V: *Θεμιστοκλῆος* *z* 6 *τῶν πρηγμάτων τούτων* **β** || *τουτέων* *z* || *ὁ θεμιστοκλέης* **β**

---

be fought in the open. The bay of Kenchreai was clearly more favourable to the Greek chances than the open waters off Salamis. The ruse of Themistokles, presently related, undoubtedly led to the battle in the straits; but it is extremely difficult to believe that in effectuating that ruse he acted without the knowledge and connivance of his colleagues (see below); it is, therefore, difficult to believe that at this stage at least the question of retreating to the Isthmos was again seriously debated. The real problem before the council was to devise, or to accept, a plan by which the Persians might be induced at dawn of day to be entering the straits. The plan devised, employed, perhaps expounded, by Themistokles was a bold one, not to be accepted without discussion.

The notion that Themistokles could slip unobserved out of the *Synedrion*, the debate still continuing without him, make his elaborate arrangements, remain outside for hours, until Aristeides arrives to report that the ruse is successful, the Persian fleet already fully surrounding the island, and then re-enter the council—still sitting—with the startling news, is simply absurd. Moreover, the reception of the news seems to show that the Greek admirals are not taken by surprise. The story, as told by Aischylos, lends absolutely no support to the tradition that the plan of Themistokles was devised as much against the Greeks themselves, his colleagues, as against the Persians, their enemies.

3. **ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Μήδων.** It is not clear above, in c. 70, whether Hdt. conceives the Persian fleet, after the manœuvres of the day, as remaining at sea, or as returning to Phaleron. This passage seems to imply that the admirals at least are ashore, for *τὸ στρατόπεδον* can hardly be used consciously for the fleet at sea. From Salamis to Phaleron it would take a man in a boat some hours to go and return—to say nothing of obtaining his interview with the Persian admirals. The admirals (*οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων*, cp. c. 67 *supra*) make their appearance here again; in Aischylos the messenger from the Greek camp has audience of the king himself (*Pers.* 355 f.).

5. **Σίκιννος.** The name is Greek (cp. *Σίκινος ἡ*, the island), Aischyl. *Pers.* 355 makes the messenger a Greek, and Plutarch *Them.* 12 is probably wrong in calling this man a 'Persian' (cp. c. 110 *infra*), though he was, no doubt, a 'domestic slave,' and 'paedagogue' or tutor. Themistokles had five sons in all, Plutarch *Them.* 32; but Polyainos 1. 30. 3 has *παιδαγωγὸς τοῖν παίδοιν*—so perhaps he had only two in 480 B.C., or two of age to have a tutor.

6. **τὸν δὴ ὕστερον . . ὄλβιον**: the emancipation, enfranchisement, enrichment of Sikinnos followed, presumably, soon after the battle of Plataiai, and, of necessity, before the ostracism of Themistokles (in 473 or 472 ?). The rebuilding and restoration of Thespiai, by the admission of citizens, was, of course, necessitated by its ruin in the war; cp. 7. 222 and c. 50 *supra*. The active **ἐποίησε** is remarkable: was the business actually entrusted to Themistokles? Thespiai may be expected to have 'atticized' subsequently: but the Thespians in 424 B.C. were severely handled by the Athenians in the battle of Oropos (Delion), Thuc. 4. 96. 3, a misfortune which enabled the Thebans shortly afterwards to demolish the walls; *ib.* 133. 1. Ten years later there was an abortive *coup d'état* by the atticizing party, Thuc. 6. 95. 3, and the dominant faction sent hoplites to Syracuse to take part in the ruin of the Athenian armada (*ib.* 7. 19. 3, 25. 3). In the next century Thespiai is the chief basis of the Spartan operations against Thebes, during the decade

Θεσπιέα τε ἐποίησε, ὡς ἐπεδέκοντο οἱ Θεσπιέες πολιήτας, καὶ χρήμασι ὄλβιον· ὃς τότε πλοίῳ ἀπικόμενος ἔλεγε πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῶν βαρβάρων τάδε. "ἔπεμψέ με στρατηγὸς ὁ Ἀθηναίων λάθρῃ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων (τυγχάνει γὰρ φρονέων τὰ βασιλέος καὶ βουλόμενος μᾶλλον τὰ ὑμέτερα κατύπερθε γίνεσθαι ἢ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρήγματα) φράσοντα ὅτι οἱ Ἕλληνες δρησμὸν βουλεύονται καταρρωδηκότες, καὶ νῦν παρέχει κάλλιστον ὑμέας ἔργων ἀπάντων ἐξεργάσασθαι, ἣν

---

7 πολιήτας S: πολίτας 9 ἔπεμψε ὁ στρατηγὸς **a** (-ν ὁ C) || ὁ om. **a**C 11 βασιλῆος z || μᾶλλον om. **B** || κατυπέρτερα **B** 12 γενέσθαι Pz 13 βούλονται **B** 14 ἔργον πάντων **B**z

---

preceding the battle of Leuktra (Xenoph. *Hell.* Bks. 5 and 6), and suffered accordingly, but must have enjoyed (like Plataia) a second or third resurrection (after the ruin of Thebes), as in the first century Thespiai and Tanagra were the only two flourishing cities in Boiotia: Strabo 403.

9. **τάδε**: the message of Themistokles, by the lips of Sikinnos, as reported by Hdt. differs in several notable respects and circumstances from the anonymous message reported by Aischylos. (i.) In Aischylos the message is despatched and received by daylight: in Hdt. by night. (ii.) In Aischylos it is received by the king: in Hdt. by the admirals. (iii.) In Aischylos the message leads the king to resolve on action, to wit, the advance of the fleet: with Hdt. the king has previously resolved to do or to offer battle. This difference is more apparent than real, as in each case the Persian fleet advances to pursue the Greeks supposed to be in flight—but the effect of the difference is to make the message perhaps even more prominent in Aischylos than in Hdt. (iv.) Far more important, with Aischylos the message in no way compromises the sender or the messenger, and there is nothing to show or to suggest that it was despatched with other than the full knowledge and approbation of the authorities on the Greek side: with Hdt. and the main tradition after his time the message is designed to outwit the Greeks no less than the Persians, nay, rather, to force the hand of the Greeks in the first instance, and compel them, against their will, to do battle at Salamis. (v.) As a further difference, the message in Aischylos reports simply a projected flight of the Greeks: the message in Hdt. proclaims the 'medism' of the sender, and of a great part of the fleet.

The 'flight' *motif* and the 'medism' *motif* might be alternatives, combined in the message as given by Hdt. The flight of the Greeks means that they are not going to do battle, but to escape, and that under cover of night. The message as given by Aischylos is thoroughly consistent with itself, and with the time and circumstances of its despatch. The message as given by Hdt. reports instant flight (in the night), but also promises medism if the flight is stayed and a battle forced on. Possibly the 'medism' has been projected back into this message from the later career of Themistokles.

στρατηγὸς ὁ Ἀθηναίων: what of his colleagues? Cp. c. 79 *infra*.

12. **οἱ Ἕλληνες δρησμὸν βουλεύονται καταρρωδηκότες**: this is virtually identical with the message as reported by Aischyl. *Pers.* 357–9. In itself it might have been sufficient to induce the Persians to resolve—not on battle, for you cannot fight a flying enemy—but on pursuit, on a forward movement, which would bring a portion at least of the Persian fleet within the straits. As the Greek fleet by that time would be well under way, the Persians might be expected to overhaul it, and come upon its rear in the bay of Eleusis, or in the narrower waters beyond. As the (fresh?) plan or disposition of the Persian admirals certainly included the stopping of the narrow channel between Salamis and the Megarid, they might be expecting to find the Greek fleet thrown into utter confusion when they came upon it by the Eleusis channel.

μὴ περιίδητε διαδράντας αὐτούς. οὔτε γὰρ ἀλλήλοισι ὁμοφρονέουσι οὔτε ἀντιστήσονται ὑμῖν, πρὸς ἑωυτούς τε σφέας ὄψεσθε ναυμαχέοντας τούς <τε> τὰ ὑμέτερα φρονέοντας καὶ τοὺς μή." ὁ μὲν ταῦτά σφι σημήνας ἐκποδὼν ἀπαλλάσσετο· **76**

τοῖσι δὲ ὡς πιστὰ ἐγίνετο τὰ ἀγγελθέντα, τοῦτο μὲν ἐς τὴν νησῖδα τὴν Ψυττάλειαν, μεταξὺ Σαλαμῖνός τε κειμένην καὶ τῆς ἠπείρου, πολλοὺς τῶν Περσέων ἀπεβιβάσαντο· τοῦτο δέ, ἐπειδὴ ἐγίνοντο μέσαι νύκτες, ἀνῆγον μὲν τὸ ἀπ' ἑσπέρης

16 οὐτέτι (ἀντιστήσονται) **ß** : οὔτ' ἔτι Schaefer, Holder, van H. || τέ σφεας AB 17 τούς <τε> Stein, van H. **76.** 1 ἀπηλλάσσετο **ß** 2 ἐγένετο z 3 νησίδα Pz || Ψυττάλειαν, del. Cobet, van H. 4 ἀπεβηβάσαντο B : ἀπεβίβασαν **ß**, Holder, van H. 5 νύκτες μέσαι **ß** || ἀπὸ **ß**

76. 1. **σημήνας**: it was a 'significant' message, much more than a hint; in what language was it conveyed? The Persians would have done well to have detained Sikinnos!

2. **τοῖσι δὲ ὡς κτλ.**: for the formula cp. cc. 80, 83 *infra*.

τοῦτο μέν: their first act, on being convinced of the projected flight of the Greeks, was to land a large force of Persians on the island of Psyttaleia. Down below the motive of this action is elaborately explained: the island lay in the thoroughfare, or waterway, of the coming battle, and the men upon it would be useful in dealing with wrecks and men, whether friends or foes.

This motivation is obviously a complete misconception, if the island Ψυττάλεια is correctly identified with the island bearing the lighthouse between Peiraieus and Salamis to-day (*Leipsokoutali*)—one Engl. mile long and from 200 to 300 yards broad: Strabo 395, and the moderns, e.g. Leake—for an island in that position could have no bearing on the operation of the Persians now in hand. Even if they were expecting a battle at all, it was surely to take place far to the west of this position: unless indeed they assumed that the Greeks would be driven back and out of the straits eastwards by the ships sent round the island to the Megarid channel. Possibly, however, Hdt. has simply mistimed the occupation of Psyttaleia. If it was the first move of the Persians, then it had been made probably on the previous day, in connexion with the manœuvres recorded in c. 70 *supra*. If it was not made during the day of the 19th Boëdromion, then it was probably only made the next morning, after the sea-fight had begun—where Aischylos might be thought to place it, or admit of its being placed.

In any case, the identification of Psyttaleia is unfavourable to the theory of Leake and Grote, according to which the Persian fleet is supposed to be already by this time inside the straits, and drawn up, in battle-array, backed by the Attic shore, and facing the bay of Salamis. (If any island called for occupation from that position—especially in view of the message of Sikinnos—it would rather be the island of *St. George*, or of Leros?) It is difficult to see how *Lipsokoutali* could be said to be ἐν πόρῳ τῆς ναυμαχίης τῆς μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι, if both forces were inside the straits, and the Persian based on the Attic shore. This passage implies that the battle was to be fought between two forces, one attempting to get out of the straits, and the other attempting to get in.

5. **ἐπειδὴ ἐγίνοντο μέσαι νύκτες.** On the phrase cp. 4. 181, 9. 51 *infra*. The night is apparently that which fell in c. 70 *supra*, and towards the fall of which the Persian army had moved in the direction of the Peloponnesos, *ibid.* Thereafter has taken place the σύλλογος in c. 74, the συνέδριον in c. 75, the performances of Themistokles and Sikinnos, culminating in the present movement of Persian soldiers and ships. The naval movement which results from the (daylight) message in Aischylos begins at nightfall (*Pers.* 374–9): a consequence of the fundamental discrepancy between our two chief authorities. For Dr. G.

κέρας κυκλούμενοι πρὸς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα, ἀνῆγον δὲ οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν Κέον τε καὶ τὴν Κυνόσουραν τεταγμένοι, κατεῖχόν τε

---

7 Κέον : *Λέρον* Lolling : *Ζέαν* Pridek, cf. Bursian. J.-B. 86. 80 ‖ *τὴν* ante *Κυνόσουραν* fortasse delendum ‖ *κατέχον* z : *κάτεχον* Bekker : (*κατεῖλόν* Stein³, oper. err.)

B. Grundy's view of the anachronism in Hdt.'s account cp. *Great Persian War*, 377 ff., and Appendix VI. § 3.

ἀνῆγον τὸ ἀπ' ἑσπέρης κέρας: the phrase seems to imply that the ships were already at sea, and in position. This implication is consistent with c. 70 *supra*, where the ships have been left apparently in the water. What, then, was the exact position of 'the western wing': how was the fleet oriented? If the fleet was in the position advocated by Leake (*vide supra*) the western wing would be the right wing; if in a position outside the straits (as appears to be here implied in the immediate context, and is alone consistent with Aischylos), then the western wing might be, and probably was, the left wing. On the former hypothesis the movement here described would have for its purpose the foreclosure of the channel into the bay of Eleusis; on the latter hypothesis (really the only tenable one) the movement is one, imperfectly and obscurely described indeed, but apparently designed to detach a part of the fleet in order to circumnavigate the island, and to bar the western channel, between the island and the Megarid. Such a movement must, indeed, have been undertaken in the course of the Persian manœuvres; to have omitted it would have been a cardinal blunder; it is actually recorded by Diodoros (Ephoros) 11. 17. 2, perhaps not from tradition, but from inference and *Sach-Kritik*; it is at best obscurely hinted, or covered, by Hdt. here and by Aischylos, *Pers.* 368.

6. **κυκλούμενοι πρὸς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα**: these words would more naturally suggest the first alternative stated in the previous note. Baehr, however, understands it *de insula circumeunda*, and that is the better sense. It may be doubted whether Hdt. himself had a very clear view of the manœuvre; he simply repeats his source. Strategy and tactics are not his *forte*, and he may have written this account before he saw the landscape.

οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν Κέον τε καὶ [τὴν] Κυνόσουραν τεταγμένοι: *prima facie* this is another squadron, contrasted with *τὸ ἀπ' ἑσπέρης κέρας*, and it is one squadron, and not two squadrons; it is not = *οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν Κέον τεταγμένοι καὶ οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν Κυνόσουραν τεταγμένοι*. It is, in fact, the other, or eastern wing. Baehr and Rawlinson are right against others and Blakesley in refusing to identify this Keos with the island, and this Kynosura with the well-known promontory by Marathon. Hdt. has brought the whole Persian fleet to Phaleron; and he (still more his sources) would have hesitated to move a squadron from Marathon to Munichia in half a September night, even if the order for moving could have been communicated. Leake identified this Kynosura with the long pointed promontory of Salamis projecting due east, and narrowing the channel between Salamis and Psyttaleia. Keos he wished to place somewhere on Salamis, or on the Attic coast opposite Kynosura, or again proposed to read *τὴν νῆσον*, i.e. Psyttaleia, which last gives good sense. But Stein more ingeniously identifies Keos with Kynosura, a younger and an elder name, 'Kynosura' being also necessitated by the oracle quoted below c. 77. The name of the island, moreover, was not *Κέος* but *Κέως*, hence the inhabitants are *Κεῖοι*, *Κήιοι*; cp. cc. 1, 46 *supra*. If the repeated article *τήν* is an obstacle to the identification of the two place-names, it may be deleted (*O passi graviora!*), or explained away, as due to Hdt.'s ignorance.

But could *οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν Κέον*, so understood, be 'the eastern wing'? They would be, or become so, at least when the western wing had moved off to circumnavigate Salamis. It is possible that the topographical indication represents rather the point of destination than the point of departure. In any case the terms **ἀνῆγον μέν — ἀνῆγον δέ** refer apparently not to a concentration of the fleet, but to a division and separation into two wings, or squadrons, moving in opposite, or independent, directions. Moreover, each squadron, in carrying out this order, may have undergone a fresh tactical disposition.

7. **κατεῖχόν τε μέχρι Μουνιχίης**:

μέχρι Μουνιχίης *πάντα τὸν πορθμὸν τῇσι νηυσί. τῶνδε δὲ εἵνεκα ἀνῆγον τὰς νέας, ἵνα δὴ τοῖσι* Ἕλλησι *μηδὲ φυγεῖν ἐξῇ, ἀλλ' ἀπολαμφθέντες ἐν τῇ* Σαλαμῖνι *δοῖεν τίσιν τῶν ἐπ'* Ἀρτεμισίῳ *ἀγωνισμάτων. ἐς δὲ τὴν νησῖδα τὴν* Ψυττάλειαν *καλεομένην ἀπεβίβαζον τῶν* Περσέων *τῶνδε εἵνεκεν, ὡς, ἐπεὰν γίνηται ναυμαχίη, ἐνθαῦτα μάλιστα ἐξοισομένων τῶν τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν ναυηγίων (ἐν γὰρ δὴ πόρῳ τῆς ναυμαχίης τῆς μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι ἔκειτο ἡ νῆσος), ἵνα τοὺς μὲν περιποιέωσι τοὺς δὲ διαφθείρωσι. ἐποίευν δὲ σιγῇ ταῦτα, ὡς μὴ πυνθανοίατο οἱ ἐναντίοι. οἳ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα τῆς νυκτὸς οὐδὲν ἀποκοιμηθέντες παραρτέοντο.*

8 Μουνυχίης Stein[1 2]: correx. van H. || *πάντα* : *παρὰ* **a**C (pace Holder) || *δὲ* om. **B**, Holder 9 *εἵνεκεν* **B** || *νῆας* **B***z* || *μὴ δὲ φυγεῖν* **a** : *μὴ φυγέειν* **B** : *μηδὲ φυγέειν* *z* : *μὴ διαφυγεῖν* mal. Stein[1] 10 *τίσι* *z* 11 *νησίδα* P*z* 12 *εἵνεκα* **a***z* 13 *γένηται* **B***z*, Holder, van H. 14 *πόρρωι* C : *πόῤῥῳ* *z* || *τῆς* ante *ναυμαχίης* om. **B**P*z*, Holder 15 *ἔσεσθαι* om. **B** || *περιποιῶσι* codd., *z*, Holder 16 *ἐποίεον* **a**

these words, especially the topographical item, might seem some justification for Grote's view that Keos and Kynosura were places somewhere on the Attic coast between Phaleron and Sunion. But the phrase applies as much to the clause ἀνῆγον μὲν τὸ ἀπ' ἑσπέρης κέρας as to the clause ἀνῆγον δὲ οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν Κέον : in other words, it applies primarily to neither, unless, indeed, Hdt. was ignorant of the position of Munichia, here alone mentioned in his work. Μουνιχίη is undoubtedly and notoriously (i.) the hill above the Peiraieus, which formed the citadel of the Athenian port; (ii.) one of the three harbours under that hill, the other two being the Peiraieus and Zea (?); cp. E. A. Gardner, *Ancient Athens* (1902) pp. 59, 544, etc.; (iii.) perhaps in early times applied to the whole, *ib.* p. 549; Strabo 395 λόφος δ' ἐστὶν ἡ Μουνυχία κτλ. ὑποπίπτουσι δ' αὐτῷ λιμένες τρεῖς.

It is curious that the roadstead μέχρι Μουνιχίης should be described as a πορθμός, a term properly used of a ferry, strait, or narrow waterway; cp. c. 91 *infra*. The whole phrase here would better apply to the situation and aspect of the Persian fleet in the bay of Phaleron than in the more open waters, between Salamis (Keos) and Munichia; yet it may be taken generally to describe the position of the Persian fleet, extending from the isle of Salamis across to Munichia (the hill, λόφος) before it broke up into two squadrons, one of which moved west, round the island, to block the Megarian channel, while the other closed up towards Keos, to block the channel between Keos and Psyttaleia, and doubtless also filled up the space between Psyttaleia and the Peiraieus (cp. c. 85 *infra*).

9. **ἵνα δὴ κτλ.**: so Hdt.'s sources (primarily Ionian?) reported: there is here no exception made for those who might 'medize,' nor any clear prospect of a set battle, but merely the purpose to prevent the 'flight'—which is treated (also in Aischylos) as a foregone conclusion. The inscriptions of Themistokles in the neighbourhood of Artemision (cp. c. 22 *supra*) held out no prospect of medism, but the reverse. **τίσιν** here = δίκην.

16. **ἐποίευν δὲ σιγῇ**: this is possible, cp. c. 74 *supra*, though the movements of the ships can hardly have failed to be observed by Greek watchers on Salamis (was there not a moon?). Moreover, if the Greek vessels were already *ex hypothesi* in flight into the bay of Eleusis, for the Megarid channel, the object of all this secrecy is not apparent.

17. **τῆς νυκτὸς οὐδὲν ἀποκοιμηθέντες**: this statement agrees with that of Aischylos; and if the mission of Sikinnos had had no result beyond keeping the Persian fleet on the go all night, it would not have been in vain. ἀποκοιμᾶσθαι is a remarkable word; cp. Aristoph. *Wasps* 213, Xenoph. *Kyrop.* 2.

77 Χρησμοῖσι δὲ οὐκ ἔχω ἀντιλέγειν ὡς οὐκ εἰσὶ ἀληθέες, οὐ βουλόμενος ἐναργέως λέγοντας πειρᾶσθαι καταβάλλειν, ἐς τοιάδε ῥήματα ἐσβλέψας.

ἀλλ' ὅταν Ἀρτέμιδος χρυσαόρου ἱερὸν ἀκτὴν
νηυσὶ γεφυρώσωσι καὶ εἰναλίην Κυνόσουραν

---

77 incipit verbis οἳ μὲν δὴ κτλ. Stein[1]: a verbo νυκτὸς usque ad c. 84. 4 οὕτω δὴ om. **B**: totum cap. (χρησμοῖσι . . ἐνδέκομαι) damn. Krueger, van H. 3 ῥήματα coni. Stein[2]: πρήγματα 4 χρυσάορον z

---

4. 22, 'perhaps a military term' L. & S., 'to take a little sleep,' or to be allowed off duty, to sleep. Stein's interpretation 'to take sufficient sleep,' to have done with sleep (ἀπο-, as in 2. 40), will hardly do.

18. **παραρτέοντο**: with object (ταῦτα), 'were busily engaged in organizing.'

77. This chapter has been challenged; it is athetized by Krueger and by van Herwerden: there are at least seven arguments against its authenticity. (i.) The matter is very abruptly introduced, without any obvious justification in the context. What has a defence of oracles to do with the manœuvres of the Persian fleet on the eve of the battle, or with the discussions of the Greek Strategoi? (ii.) There is some doubt whether the oracle cited originally referred to Salamis at all; see detailed notes below. (iii.) The language, not indeed of the oracle, but of the writer, is peculiar, and his style somewhat incoherent. Would Hdt. not have expressed himself somewhat differently? (iv.) We should hardly expect to find Hdt. taking Bakis, rather than Delphi, as his *point d'appui* in his Apologetic. (v.) The defence might have been introduced more aptly in c. 96 *infra*. (vi.) The oracle is a *vaticinium post eventum*. (vii.) The passage is omitted in **B**. But these objections are inconclusive both severally and cumulatively. Thus (i.) Hdt. makes digressions, and the description of the Persian fleet as filling the whole 'ferry' or *Fahrweg* might be excuse enough for introducing an oracle interpreted to refer to this appearance. (ii.) The correctness of the reference is neither here nor there; it is clear that the reference was actually made: why not by Hdt. if by any one? (iii.) Hdt. waxes incoherent at times, especially when excited. (iv.) Bakis and such seers would stand most in need of defence: many might impugn Bakis, who would hesitate to challenge Delphi. (v.) The reference in c. 96 presupposes this quotation. (vi.) Even if a *vatic. p. event.* like many other oracles, there was time enough between the dates of Salamis and of Hdt.'s composition for the invention of the verses. (vii.) The better class of MSS. have this chapter, and the inferior omit not merely this chapter, but a good deal besides; cp. App. Crit. But this chapter is plainly an insertion; cp. c. 78 *ad init.*

Stein, who admits the authenticity of the chapter, seems to regard the argument as a reply to the scepticism current at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. If so, it would belong to the third, or final draft of Hdt.'s history. But the reference in c. 98 is (I think) in favour of an earlier insertion, and scepticism was not a novelty in 431 B.C. I should be inclined to regard this chapter as belonging to the second draft, and as written after Hdt.'s first visit to Athens. Cp. Introduction, § 9.

2. **καταβάλλειν**, in a peculiar sense: *deicere, reicere*. The use in 9. 79 is not quite identical. **ῥήματα** (cp. App. Crit.) is an emendation: πρήγματα, if genuine, would be still more peculiar, as used apparently for the lines following. Still more peculiar, or at least incoherent, is the sentence which concludes the chapter. See below.

4. **ἀλλ' ὅταν κτλ.**: the oracle itself has a thoroughly genuine ring. The formula is reproduced by Aristophanes in his parody: *Knights* 197 ἀλλ' ὁπόταν κτλ.

Ἀρτέμιδος χρυσαόρου ἱερὸν ἀκτήν. Hesiod uses ἱερὸν ἀκτὴν (Δημήτερος) in the sense of 'corn,' Homer uses the word of 'meal' (cp. L. & S. *sub v.*). Here, of course, ἀκτή means 'the strand,' shore. What strand?

(1) Leake understood it of Salamis, or a part of Salamis: Pausan. 1. 36. 1 ἐν

ἐλπίδι μαινομένῃ, λιπαρὰς πέρσαντες Ἀθήνας,
δῖα δίκη σβέσσει κρατερὸν κόρον, ὕβριος υἱόν,
δεινὸν μαιμώοντα, δοκεῦντ' ἀνὰ πάντα πίεσθαι.
χαλκὸς γὰρ χαλκῷ συμμείξεται, αἵματι δ' Ἄρης
πόντον φοινίξει. τότ' ἐλεύθερον Ἑλλάδος ἦμαρ
εὐρύοπα Κρονίδης ἐπάγει καὶ πότνια Νίκη.

---

8 *ἀναπάντα* AB: *ἂν ἅπαντα* Steger: *ἀν' ἅπαντα* Stein[1] || *πίεσθαι* Duentzer, Stein[2], Holder (*πιέσθαι* van H. oper. err.): *πιθέσθαι* AP, Stein[1]: *πειθεσθαι* B: *τίθεσθαι* C: *πυθέσθαι* z: (*ἅμα πάντ' ἐφικέσθαι* (sic) Naber) 10 *φοινίξῃ* z

---

Σαλαμῖνι δὲ . . τοῦτο μὲν Ἀρτέμιδός ἐστιν ἱερόν, τοῦτο δὲ τρόπαιον ἕστηκεν ἀπὸ τῆς νίκης κτλ., and placed it on the west coast of the bay of *Ambelaki*: if this were correct the *γέφυρα* would seem to be formed by the Hellenic ships; unless, indeed, the reference were to the (projected) bridge of boats from Attica to Salamis, c. 97 *infra*. But the latter interpretation would ill suit *Κυνόσουρα*.

(2) A more famous strand of Artemis was that by Brauron, on the east coast of Attica. If that were the strand in view, then Kynosura would naturally be the best known promontory of the name at Marathon; and the reference in the oracle would rather be to the battle of Marathon than to the battle of Salamis. Blakesley, who identifies this Kynosura with the Marathonian, would place the Artemisian strand on the Euboian coast, near Eretria, where was a temple of Artemis Amarusia, which might give a better sense for *γεφυρώσωσι*.

(3) The most obvious identification is to regard the *Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸς ἀκτή* here in question as the Attic shore near the temple of Artemis Munichia (*Μουνυχίας ναὸς Ἀρτέμιδος* Pausan. 1. 1. 4), and so R. Adam *de Hdti. ratione historica* (1890) p. 22, Goodwin, and others. The bridging of the sea from Munichia to Kynosura in this case, of course, would simply mean the appearance presented by the vast numbers of the Persian fleet, which, extending in line (or rather in three lines, cp. Aisch. *Pers.* 366) from the Peiraieus to *Hagia Varvara*, might be taken to present the appearance of a bridge, or raft, covering the sea.

(4) It has been suggested (J. A. R. Munro, *J.H.S.* xx. 1902, p. 306) that the real reference in this oracle is to the Artemision at the north end of Euboia, which has already figured largely in Hdt. Kynosura he refers to the Marathonian promontory of that name, and interprets the oracle as having originally promised a victory to Hellas when her enemies bridged with their ships the channels at the north and south ends of Euboia. But (1) if the reference had been to the circumnavigation of Euboia, Chalkis rather than Kynosura would surely have marked the southern channel. (2) Even if *πότνια Νίκη* could have been predicated or predicted of the sea-fights off North Euboia, (3) the reference to the sack of Athens, *λιπαρὰς πέρσαντες Ἀθήνας*, as antecedent of the 'bridging,' points clearly to Salamis, and shows that the previous solution is the correct one. But the oracle looks like a *vaticinium post eventum*.

χρυσαόρου: gen. of *χρυσάορος* = *χρυσάωρ*, 'with sword of gold,' not a specific epithet of Artemis, but found (practically) attached to Apollo, Zeus, Demeter, Orpheus; cp. L. & S. *sub v.* (Chrysaor, as proper name, Hesiod, *Theog.* 280).

6. **λιπαράς**: a favourite epithet of Athens, as is plain from Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 639 f. etc., and so first in Pindar *Isth.* 2. 30, *Nem.* 4. 18 (unless this oracle of Bakis were earlier?), but also used by Pindar of other places, Marathon, Orchomenos, Thebes, Smyrna, Naxos, Egypt. Cp. Rumpel, *Lexikon Pind. sub v.*, who makes it = *splendidus, nitidus*. In reference to Athens it might well carry a special suggestion of the olive and its oil; cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

7. **δῖα δίκη κτλ.**: the personifications in this line, and also the alliterations in this and the following line, should not be lost, just for want of capitals.

8. **ἀνὰ πάντα πίεσθαι**, a tmesis: *πίεσθαι*, cp. App. Crit., future of *πίνω*, but *ἀναπίνω* is rare, late, and technical; cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

10. **φοινίξει**: perhaps no pun was intended. But are *φοινός* (*φόνος*) and *Φοῖνιξ*

[ἐς] τοιαῦτα μὲν καὶ οὕτω ἐναργέως λέγοντι Βάκιδι ἀντιλογίης χρησμῶν πέρι οὔτε αὐτὸς λέγειν τολμέω οὔτε παρ' ἄλλων ἐνδέκομαι.

78 Τῶν δὲ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι στρατηγῶν ἐγίνετο ὠθισμὸς λόγων πολλός· ᾔδεσαν δὲ οὔκω ὅτι σφέας περιεκυκλεῦντο τῇσι νηυσὶ οἱ βάρβαροι, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τῆς ἡμέρης ὥρων αὐτοὺς τεταγμένους,
79 ἐδόκεον κατὰ χώρην εἶναι. συνεστηκότων δὲ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐξ

12 ἐς del. Stein[3]: idem mihi visum erat (ἐς e verb. ἐς τοιάδε supra repetitum) || μὲν <ἐσβλέψας> e coni. Stein[1 2] in text. recep. van H. || ἀντιλογίης: ἀντιλογίην Reiske, (van H.): ἀντιλογίας vel potius δι' ἀντιλογίης, cum ἐλθεῖν pro λέγειν, Wesseling approb. van H.: αὐτός τι vel τολμέω οὐδὲν suspic. Stein (οὔτε τι Stein[1]) || τολμέωι B 78. 2 περιεκυκλέοντο **a**: περικυκλέοντο C: περιεκυκλοῦντο Pz, Holder, van H.

not connected etymologically? Cp. 7. 89 *supra*.

12. **[ἐς] τοιαῦτα μὲν . . ἐνδέκομαι**: an admittedly difficult passage, and perhaps corrupt; cp. App. Crit. ἐς is unmeaning; it might be dittographed from ἐς τοιάδε *supra*. There is no direct object expressed for λέγειν. ἀντιλογίας might be supplied with Wesseling, or τι after αὐτὸς or οὐδὲν after τολμέω with Stein. **Βάκιδι ἀντιλογίης χρησμῶν πέρι** is odd: Stein takes B. ἀντ. together (of speaking against Bakis) and χρ. πέρι absolutely, cp. 7. 237 *supra*. The genitive ἀντιλογίης remains in suspense. On Bakis cp. c. 20 *supra*.

78. 1. **τῶν δέ κτλ.** corresponds grammatically with τοιαῦτα μέν just before, and that badly; it corresponds really and well enough with οἱ μὲν δή κτλ., c. 76 *ad f.*, and thus clearly betrays c. 77 for an insertion.

ὠθισμός: cp. 7. 225 *supra*; they were not merely skirmishing, or using light weapons, cp. c. 64 *supra*.

2. **ὅτι σφέας περιεκυκλεῦντο κτλ.**: these words primarily support the theory of Leake (cp. Appendix VI. § 3) as to the position attained by the Persian fleet in c. 70 *supra*. The περικύκλωσις as a manœuvre round the outside of the island for the purpose of closing the Megarid channel is not clearly envisaged or affirmed by Hdt., nevertheless it probably underlies this and his similar expressions.

The verb is here imperfect, but even so a considerable lapse of time is presupposed and involved in the session of the Strategoi on this occasion: they are sitting up all night (the Persian manœuvre only began at midnight, c. 76 *supra*) and will get as little sleep as the Persian admirals themselves!

3. **ὥσπερ τῆς ἡμέρης ὥρων αὐτοὺς τεταγμένους**: this phrase implies that the Persian fleet had attained on the previous day a definite disposition, as in c. 70 *supra*, in that position was visible to the Greeks, and had not returned to port, or anchorage. Where exactly was that position? Probably its lines presented the 'bridge' from Keos = Kynosura, to Munichia-Peiraieus, with Psyttaleia about the centre of the position. The fleet had now, however, divided, the one wing, the left, moving away west to block the Megarid channel, the rest moving up closer into the channels either side of Psyttaleia, especially the eastern; other vessels, no doubt, may have been posted, or cruising off the SE. coast of Salamis, and others held in reserve at Phaleron.

79. 1. **συνεστηκότων τῶν στρατηγῶν**: for the verb cp. c. 27 *supra*. As to the tense Blakesley renders it, "after the commanders had come to a direct issue"; but the sense rather demands a present or imperfect, 'while the generals were still contesting the matter,' i.e. before they had come to a decision; and that suits the material sense of the word.

ἐξ Αἰγίνης: there is a precision about this, which is seductive. Had Aristeides spent his exile in the island (cp. Ἀθην. πολ. 22. 8), the war with which was hardly his policy? Or would he have been in Aigina at this time, if the feud with Athens had not been composed (7. 145 *supra*)? Or was he there on the mission to the Aiakidai (c. 64

Αἰγίνης διέβη Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου, ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος μὲν ἐξωστρακισμένος δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου· τὸν ἐγὼ νενόμικα, πυνθανόμενος αὐτοῦ τὸν τρόπον, ἄριστον ἄνδρα γενέσθαι ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι καὶ δικαιότατον. οὗτος ὡνὴρ στὰς ἐπὶ τὸ συνέδριον ἐξεκαλέετο Θεμιστοκλέα, ἐόντα μὲν ἑωυτῷ οὐ φίλον ἐχθρὸν δὲ τὰ μάλιστα· ὑπὸ δὲ μεγάθεος τῶν παρεόντων κακῶν λήθην ἐκείνων ποιεύμενος ἐξεκαλέετο, θέλων αὐτῷ συμμεῖξαι· προακηκόεε δὲ ὅτι

79. 6 *Θεμιστοκλῆα* z   8 *συμμῖξαι* Stein[1,2], cp. c. 67. 5 || *προακηκόεε* Matthiae : *προακηκόει* van H. : *προακήκοε*

supra)? The trireme despatched for them appears to return next morning, c. 83 *infra*; but see note *ad l.*

2. **Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου**: his first appearance on the scene in Hdt., hence the patronymic, which is repeated with *ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος* in c. 95 *infra*, suggesting that the two passages are from different sources, and perhaps belong to different drafts. The anecdote which here follows is part of the legend of Themistokles. Lysimachos is a common Greek name; upwards of twenty men are known to have borne it. Of the father of Aristeides nothing more is recorded, but he was of course, like his son, of the tribe Antiochis and of the deme Alopeke (Plutarch *Aristeid.* 1); no doubt a man of substance, and perhaps of the Alkmaionid party. The ostrakism of Aristeides had taken place in 483 B.C. obviously to clear the way for the naval law of Themistokles (cp. Appendix III. § 4), and he had been recalled with all other exiles in 481 B.C. Stein supposes that the law of amnesty had only just been passed, otherwise Aristeides would have appeared sooner in the camp. But is the texture of the Herodotean historiography so close as to convince us that this was the actual *κάθοδος* of Aristeides? Far more probable is J. B. Bury's idea (*Class. Rev.* x. 1896, 414 ff.), that Aristeides was at this moment one of the Athenian Strategoi duly elected in the spring of 480 B.C., otherwise, indeed, his exploit in c. 95 *infra* is hardly intelligible. As such he would presumably have been present at the Synedrion of Strategoi, unless we are to suppose that only one Strategos from each state was present. If the anecdote here given is anything more than a fable, Aristeides must have been away on special service; in which case a mission to Aigina presents itself as the most plausible hypothesis to account for his movements. That mission, if not to invoke the Aiakidai, may have been for the purpose of convoying Athenian refugees; cp. c. 41 *supra*.

3. **τὸν ἐγὼ νενόμικα . . δικαιότατον.** This personal judgement is most significant. In the controversy over the rival merits of Themistokles and Aristeides, Hdt. definitely takes sides with the latter: of the moral superiority of Aristeides he has no doubt; his mind is absolutely made up once for all on that question (hence the perfect tense). Thucydides' celebrated defence of Themistokles (1. 138) only affects his intellectual qualities, and his policy. The reputation of Aristeides was based probably upon four leading points, all subsequent to his ostrakism and restoration: (i.) his *Strategia* at Plataia; (ii.) his full acceptance of the naval destiny of Athens; (iii.) his great services in connexion with the foundation of the maritime hegemony, including the *τάξις φόρου*; (iv.) his popular reforms of the Constitution. But, above all, probably his personal character, honesty, and honour contributed to his apotheosis. See further, Appendix *l.c.*

5. **στὰς ἐπὶ τὸ συνέδριον**, 'presented himself at the council of generals': perhaps *καταστάς* (cp. 3. 46, 156) might be expected; but he is not yet inside, actually in the presence of the council.

ἐξεκαλέετο, middle, by means of a messenger? **ὑπό**, 'by reason of.' **ἐκείνων**: not, of course, *τὰ μάλιστα*, but more vaguely, 'their previous quarrels.' **συμμεῖξαι**, as in c. 67 *supra*.

8. **προακηκόεε**: the pluperfect time reinforced by the *compositum*; how and where had he heard of the intentions of the 'Peloponnesians'? Well, it might, of course, be merely since his arrival in Salamis, but more is probably intended.

σπεύδοιεν οἱ ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσου ἀνάγειν τὰς νέας πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμόν. ὡς δὲ ἐξῆλθέ οἱ Θεμιστοκλέης, ἔλεγε Ἀριστείδης τάδε. "ἡμέας στασιάζειν χρεόν ἐστι εἰ ἐν τεῷ ἄλλῳ καιρῷ καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν τῷδε περὶ τοῦ ὁκότερος ἡμέων πλέω ἀγαθὰ τὴν πατρίδα ἐργάσεται. λέγω δέ τοι ὅτι ἴσον ἐστὶ πολλά τε καὶ ὀλίγα λέγειν περὶ ἀποπλόου τοῦ ἐνθεῦτεν Πελοποννησίοισι. ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτόπτης τοι λέγω γενόμενος ὅτι νῦν οὐδ' ἢν θέλωσι Κορίνθιοί τε καὶ αὐτὸς Εὐρυβιάδης οἷοί τε ἔσονται ἐκπλῶσαι· περιεχόμεθα γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων κύκλῳ. ἀλλ' ἐσελθών
80 σφι ταῦτα σήμηνον." ὁ δ' ἀμείβετο τοισίδε. "κάρτα τε

9 νῆας z 11 χρεόν AB: χρεών || εἰ ἐν τεῷ Stein[3] (ἔν τέ τεῳ Gomperz, Holder, van H.): ἔν τε τῷ (τε om. z) 13 τῇ πατρίδι z || τοι om. z || ἶσον d, hic et alibi prob. Cobet: sed cf. van Herwerden vol. iii. p. vi. 80. 1 τοῖσιδε Marc., Stein: τοῖσδε

11. **στασιάζειν**: with such a man even *στάσις* turns to good; 'now, if ever, is the opportunity for us to rival each other in promoting the good of our common country.' But the phrase is rather overstrained in the mouth of the returned exile, who has merely some valuable information to communicate to the commander-in-chief of the forces! Does Aristeides already foresee his own performance on the morrow, in c. 95 *infra*, which was to be magnified into one of the chiefest episodes of the *ἐλεύθερον Ἑλλάδος ἦμαρ*? Or is the phrase more than the formula of a stock debating question, *ὁκότερος αὐτῶν* (sc. A. and Th.) *πλέω ἀγαθὰ τὴν πατρίδα εἰργασμένος εἴη*;

15. **ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτόπτης . . κύκλῳ.** If this announcement referred simply to a *περικύκλωσις* by the Persian fleet inside the straits (as in Leake's theory), the Greeks themselves in Salamis would scarcely have failed to perceive it, and Aristeides' announcement would have been stale news. Or again, if Aristeides had merely meant that the Persians had moved up and blocked the passages right and left of Psyttaleia, that movement would not have constituted a *περικύκλωσις*, and a way of escape by the Megarid channel would still have been open to the Peloponnesians. Moreover, on neither of these hypotheses is it clear how Aristeides should have reached Salamis. If the bay of *Ambelaki* was blocked, he might have landed somewhere on the sea-front of the island, and made his way overland to the Greek laager; but he would not have been more an *autoptes* than hosts of others. If only the eastern ends of the straits were blocked, he might have come in by the west—but by the same channel the Greeks might go out. The only adequate meaning of the message is that both ends, that by Psyttaleia or Kynosura, and that by Megara-Budoron (Thuc. 2. 94. 4), are closed and held by Persian ships. Probably every one knew by this time that such was the case with the eastern end; the news Aristeides brings is that there is a squadron blocking the western outlet. Coming from Aigina he might have discovered that by crossing the path of that squadron on its way, or perhaps by having to fly before it. How his own ship reached Salamis is not specified; but he may have come in by the Budoron channel. If there were Persian ships patrolling the coast of Salamis towards the open sea, the *περικύκλωσις* would be still more effective; but it was complete, as far as the argument requires, by the closure of both outlets from the straits.

18. **σήμηνον**: of important, significant news; cp. c. 76 *supra*.

80. 1. **ὁ δ' ἀμείβετο**: Themistokles responds, and gives himself completely away. Had he really been playing the very dangerous game ascribed to him, and attempting to outwit not the Persians but his colleagues, he would have known how to contain himself in the presence of his personal enemy. But perhaps we take the record too seriously, and

χρηστὰ διακελεύεαι καὶ εὖ ἤγγειλας· τὰ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐδεόμην γενέσθαι, αὐτὸς αὐτόπτης γενόμενος ἥκεις. ἴσθι γὰρ ἐξ ἐμέο τὰ ποιεύμενα ὑπὸ Μήδων· ἔδεε γάρ, ὅτε οὐκ ἑκόντες ἤθελον ἐς μάχην κατίστασθαι οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀέκοντας παραστήσασθαι. σὺ δὲ ἐπεί περ ἥκεις χρηστὰ ἀπαγγέλλων, αὐτός σφι ἄγγειλον. ἢν γὰρ ἐγὼ αὐτὰ λέγω, δόξω πλάσας λέγειν καὶ οὐ πείσω, ὡς οὐ ποιεύντων τῶν βαρβάρων ταῦτα. ἀλλά σφι σήμηνον αὐτὸς παρελθὼν ὡς ἔχει. ἐπεὰν δὲ σημήνῃς, ἢν μὲν πείθωνται, ταῦτα δὴ τὰ κάλλιστα, ἢν δὲ αὐτοῖσι μὴ πιστὰ γένηται, ὅμοιον ἡμῖν ἔσται· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι διαδρήσονται, εἴ περ περιεχόμεθα πανταχόθεν, ὡς σὺ λέγεις." ἐνθαῦτα ἔλεγε παρελθὼν ὁ 81
Ἀριστείδης, φάμενος ἐξ Αἰγίνης τε ἥκειν καὶ μόγις <δι>εκπλῶσαι λαθὼν τοὺς ἐπορμέοντας· περιέχεσθαι γὰρ πᾶν τὸ στρατό-

3 'fortasse αὐτὰ ταῦτα αὐτόπτης' van H. 4 τὰ : τάδε Krueger : ταῦτα Cobet, van H. : <ποιεύμενα> τὰ Naber || ἔθελον Pz 5 παραστήσεσθαι C 8 ὡς . . ταῦτα secl. van H. 10 ταῦτα δὴ τὰ κάλλιστα secl. Krueger, τὰ tantum Naber, van H. 11 ὁμοῖον CPz
81. 1 ἐνθαῦτα Krueger, Stein[2], van H. : ταῦτα 2 διεκπλῶσαι Naber, van H., Stein[3] : ἐκπλῶσαι

Themistokles, in this private interview, preserved his discretion, and said to Aristeides—something quite other than this report? *À la bonne heure!* But then, what becomes of any private speech or conversation reported by Hdt.?

2. **διακελεύεαι**: referring to the honourable and magnanimous *στάσις* to which Aristeides has challenged him. *διακελεύεσθαι*, 'to encourage one another'; cp. 1. 1, 3. 77. It is also used more simply, 'to exhort,' 'command,' as in c. 84 *infra*.

ἐδεόμην, 'I was wanting,' c. 59 *supra*.

3. **αὐτόπτης**: sc. *αὐτῶν* or *τούτων*.

ἐξ ἐμέο is predicative. **ἔδεε**, sc. *ἐμέ*. **παραστήσασθαι**, trans., sc. *ἐς μάχην*. **ἑκόντες ἤθελον**, redundant, for the sake of the *ἀέκοντας* to follow. **αὐτά**, 'what you have said,' 'the news.'

7. **δόξω πλάσας λέγειν**, 'I shall be thought to have invented what I say.' Such, alas, was his reputation!

οὐ πείσω, ὡς οὐ ποιεύντων . . ταῦτα, 'I shall not persuade them, as (they are convinced) the barbarians are not doing that.' This *ὡς* has a good deal to carry, but is eased a little by the *δόξω πλάσας* just before. But cp. App. Crit.

9. **παρελθών**: sc. right into the presence of the Synedrion of generals.

11. **περιεχόμεθα πανταχόθεν**: a stronger phrase than *περιεχόμεθα κύκλῳ supra*, and hardly accurate unless the whole island were surrounded.

81. 1. **παρελθὼν ὁ Ἀριστείδης**: into the very presence of the Strategoi; cp. c. 79. 5 *supra*.

2. **μόγις <δι->εκπλῶσαι λαθὼν τοὺς ἐπορμέοντας**: as the vulgate *ἐκπλῶσαι* must mean 'to sail out,' Aristeides appears to report either the difficulty he had had in getting from Salamis to Aigina, or—as Hdt. does not conceive him starting in the first instance from Salamis—the difficulty he had experienced in getting out from Aigina, in which case *τοὺς ἐπορμέοντας* would be a squadron blockading Aigina. But this interpretation squares ill with the words which immediately follow, apparently as justification. It remains to interpret *ἐκπλῶσαι* of escaping from a pursuing squadron. The emendation *διεκπλῶσαι* (*vid.* App. Crit.), though a bit of rationalism, is rather favoured by *λαθών* and by *διεκπλεύσας*, Plutarch *Aristeid.* 8.

3. **περιέχεσθαι γὰρ . . Ξέρξεω**: these words again favour Leake's interpretation of the movements predicated in cc. 70, 76 *supra*, and point to the conclusion that, so far as Hdt. himself

πεδον τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ὑπὸ τῶν νεῶν τῶν Ξέρξεω· παραρτέεσθαί
τε συνεβούλευε ὡς ἀλεξησομένους. καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα εἴπας
μετεστήκεε, τῶν δὲ αὖτις ἐγίνετο λόγων ἀμφισβασίη· οἱ γὰρ
82 *πλεῦνες τῶν στρατηγῶν οὐκ ἐπείθοντο τὰ ἐσαγγελθέντα. ἀπι-*
στεόντων δὲ τούτων ἧκε τριήρης ἀνδρῶν Τηνίων αὐτομολέουσα,
τῆς ἦρχε ἀνὴρ Παναίτιος ὁ Σωσιμένεος, ἥ περ δὴ ἔφερε τὴν
ἀληθείην πᾶσαν. διὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον ἐνεγράφησαν Τήνιοι
ἐν Δελφοῖσι ἐς τὸν τρίποδα ἐν τοῖσι τὸν βάρβαρον κατελοῦσι.

4 *ξέρξεωι* B 6 *ἀμφισβησίη* z || *οἱ πλεῦνες γὰρ* z 7 *ἐξαγγελθέντα* z **82.** 2 *τουτέων* z 3 *ἀνὴρ Τήνιος*? Stein[1, 2]: *ἀνὴρ* <*τῶν ἐπιφανέων*> Schenkl: *Τήνιος* inser. Krueger (1856): 'Sin minus, dele *ἀνήρ*' van H. || *ἔφερε*: 'An *ἔφαινε*?' van H. 4 *ἀληθηίην* z || *ἐγράφησαν* C

has any clear conception of the situation, he justifies Leake's interpretation. The result thereby attained is indeed an absurdity, but if a military expert and topographer like Leake could swallow it, why not Herodotus?

4. **παραρτέεσθαι**: here strictly middle and reflexive; cp. c. 76 *supra*.

6. **μετεστήκεε**, 'withdrew'; the tense is rather rhetorical than grammatically exigent. For the meaning cp. Thuc. 5. 111. 6 (*μεταστάντων ἡμῶν*). **λόγων ἀμφισβασίη**: cp. 4. 14—something less than λ. *ὠθισμός* c. 78 and more than the *ἀκροβολισμός* c. 64. If the *περικύκλωσις* had been simply in the bay of *Ambelaki* the truth could have very easily been verified. The reputation of Aristeides for *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἀρετή* does not appear to have been as yet established, at least in Peloponnesian circles.

82. 2. **ἧκε** is perfect in sense, not to say pluperfect: evidently *ἐληλύθεε* might quite well stand here. Cp. c. 83 *infra*. The participle agreeing with the ship and not with the men (**αὐτομολέουσα**) is piquant; and so it is the trireme that carries the truth.

Τηνίων. The Tenians have been mentioned, c. 66 *supra*, as joining the fleet of Xerxes, apparently after Thermopylai-Artemision. But the nesiote ships are all probably included in the 17 counted to the navy, 7. 95 *supra*. Tenos is located in 4. 33, 6. 97 (lying immediately S. of Andros, and N. of Mykonos, Delos, Rheneia). The ship here in question was probably the one and only Tenian trireme in existence. Tenos paid (as a rule) 3 talents tribute to Athens afterwards.

3. **Παναίτιος ὁ Σωσιμένεος.** Panaitios is a grand but not an uncommon name, its chief bearer, son of Nikagoras, of Rhodes, a celebrated Stoic, the friend of P. Scipio Aemilianus (Cicero, *pro Murena*, § 66, etc.). But of the gallant (**ἀνήρ**) Tenian, and his father Sosimenes, nothing more is known. The desertion of the Tenians scarcely looks as though the Greeks on the Persian side despaired of the good cause. Plutarch by a lapse writes Tenedos (*Themist.* 12); Diodor. 11. 17. 3 reports a message, sent by the Ionians and carried by a Samian, to apprise the Greeks of the king's plans and dispositions, and to promise their own desertion; this covers the 'Aristeides' and 'Tenian' episodes in Hdt. Stein defends *ἀνήρ* (cp. App. Crit.) by ref. to *Il.* 11. 92 *ἕλε δ' ἄνδρα Βιήνορα*, Sophokl. *El.* 95.

4. **ἔργον**: a derring deed! cp. Index.

ἐνεγράφησαν . . ἐς τὸν τρίποδα. As the inscription is still legible, the statement of Hdt. can be verified. The name of the Tenians appears, not strictly speaking 'on the tripod,' which was of gold, but on the *τρικάρηνος ὄφις*, which was of bronze; cp. 9. 81. It is the fourth name on the seventh coil (no other coil has more than three names), and is inscribed more deeply than the rest, in Ionic letters, an addition probably made by the Tenians themselves, 'by permission'; cp. Hicks, *Manual*[2], No. 19 [12], Dittenberger 7 [1], Michel 1118, and Appendix I.

5. **ἐν τοῖσι τὸν βάρβαρον κατελοῦσι.** Stein thinks that the word *κατελοῦσι* must have occurred on the inscription, and quotes Thuc. 1. 132. 3. The word there is *συγκαθελοῦσαι*, and

σύν τε ὧν ταύτῃ τῇ νηὶ τῇ αὐτομολησάσῃ ἐς Σαλαμῖνα καὶ τῇ πρότερον ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον τῇ Λημνίῃ ἐξεπληροῦτο τὸ ναυτικὸν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἐς τὰς ὀγδώκοντα καὶ τριηκοσίας νέας· δύο γὰρ δὴ νεῶν τότε κατέδεε ἐς τὸν ἀριθμόν.

Τοῖσι δὲ Ἕλλησι ὡς πιστὰ δὴ τὰ λεγόμενα ἦν τῶν Τηνίων 83
[ῥήματα], παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς ναυμαχήσοντες. ἠώς τε διέφαινε καὶ οἳ σύλλογον τῶν ἐπιβατέων ποιησάμενοι, προηγόρευε εὖ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐκ πάντων Θεμιστοκλέης, τὰ δὲ ἔπεα ἦν πάντα

---

6 σύν τε Stein[3] : σὺν δὴ Krueger : σὺν δὲ 8 νῆας z 9 νηῶν z
83. 2 ῥήματα intercl. Stein, Holder, van H. || τε δὴ ἔφαινε AB : τε δὴ διέφαινε Wesseling, van H.

---

the extant inscription does not support the inference—having merely the title *τοίδε τὸν πόλεμον ἐπολέμεον*. But the inscr. is not complete. (This passage might have been added after Hdt.'s visit to Delphi; cp. Introduction, § 9.)

6. **σύν τε ὧν κτλ.** : a noticeable passage, containing, as it does, two implicit references back to antecedent passages, obvious to steady readers of the work. (1) In c. 48 *supra* Hdt. has given the total of the fleet as 378. (2) In c. 11 *supra ad f.* Hdt. has recorded the glorious desertion of Antidoros of Lemnos. Why has not the Lemnian been included in the navy-list in cc. 42–48 *supra*? Is not the omission due to Hdt.'s method of working from independent sources without co-ordinating the results?

83. 1. **τοῖσι δὲ Ἕλλησι κτλ.** Blakesley considers this passage so confused as to be "quite inexplicable on the mere hypothesis of slovenly writing," and re-writes it not very happily. The chapter is confused, and partially corrupt, but the main purport is clear.

2. **ἠώς τε . . καί** : an effective parataxis. The night has apparently been spent by the Greeks, certainly by the Greek Strategoi, no less wakefully than by the enemy. It must be the Strategoi who are referred to in the demonstrative **οἵ**.

3. **σύλλογον τῶν ἐπιβατέων** : in c. 74 *supra* there comes a *σύλλογος τῶν στρατηγῶν* (Plutarch *Aristeid.* 8). The assembly of *Epibatai* must have been held on shore. The ships were in the water, the rowers on board. The battle was not to be so much a question of manœuvring as of hand-to-hand fighting, in the good old style: laying ships alongside, and boarding!

σύλλογον ποιησάμενοι cuts both ways. There was a plurality of conveners, but not necessarily of speakers. It is not quite clear whether each Strategos addressed his own *Epibatai*, or whether Themistokles was the sole speaker, as he is certainly the sole speaker reported. The total number of *Epibatai* is a matter of conjecture or inference, and might have varied with different contingents. Plutarch, *Themist.* 14, says that at Salamis the number was 18 per ship: if correct that estimate would give 6840 for the 380 ships. Hdt. gives 30 men as the number of *Epibatai* on the Persian side, 7. 184 *supra*—by no means a trustworthy figure in itself for the whole fleet, much less directly transferable to the Greek. If so transferred, it would give a total of 11,400. At the battle of Lade, in 494 B.C., there had been 40 Epibatai on each of the Chian vessels (6. 15), a very large allowance. During the Peloponnesian war, a time when ships were themselves the weapon of offence, and more was done by manœuvring and ramming, the normal complement was only 10 (Thuc. 2. 92, 102, 3. 91, 95, 4. 76, 101). It would be fairly safe to say that at Salamis there were from 7000 to 10,000 *Epibatai* on the Greek side.

4. **ἐκ πάντων** suggests that he was chosen or allowed to speak out of and on behalf of all; but it might mean that of all who spoke he was the most eminent and successful on the occasion (and so he alone is reported).

τὰ δὲ ἔπεα ἦν : the speech of Themistokles, verily *ἔπεα πτερόεντα*, may have been addressed solely, or

<τὰ> κρέσσω τοῖσι ἥσσοσι ἀντιτιθέμενα, ὅσα δὴ ἐν ἀνθρωπου
φύσι καὶ καταστάσι ἐγγίνεται· παραινέσας δὲ τούτων τὰ
κρέσσω αἱρέεσθαι καὶ καταπλέξας τὴν ῥῆσιν, ἐσβαίνειν ἐκέλευε
ἐς τὰς νέας. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἐσέβαινον, καὶ ἧκε ἡ ἀπ'
84 Αἰγίνης τριήρης, ἣ κατὰ τοὺς Αἰακίδας ἀπεδήμησε. ἐνθαῦτα
ἀνῆγον τὰς νέας ἁπάσας Ἕλληνες, ἀναγομένοισι δέ σφι αὐτίκα

---

5 <τὰ> Dobree, Holder, van H., Stein[3] || κρείσσω **α** || ἀντιτιθέμενα ὅσα δὴ A[2]: ἀντιτιθέμενα· ὅσα δὲ (δὴ Holder: δὲ secl. et punctum post ἐγγίνεται pos. Gomperz, van H.) 6 φύσει καὶ καταστάσει **α**C || δὲ BC: δὴ 7 αιρέσθαι (sic) A[1] || καταπλήξας C || κρῆσιν A[1]B || ἐκβαίνειν C || ἐκέλευσε **α** 8 νῆας *z* || μὲν : τε ? Stein[2] **84.** 2 νῆας *z* || οἱ Ἕλληνες *z*, van H.

---

primarily, to an Athenian audience, and reported from an Athenian source; it was no doubt a short speech, though not so short as this brief summary, or 'concept' thereof; but the speaker was evidently no mean orator. The speech comprised three heads: (i.) A series of antitheses, in which the better and the worse, the noble and the base alternatives in human nature, circumstances, and also no doubt actions, were contrasted. Hdt. characteristically fails to distinguish clearly between action and circumstance (cp. 7. 152 *supra*). (ii.) An appeal, or exhortation (*παραίνεσις*) to his hearers to choose the better part, liberty, honour, death, rather than slavery, defeat, the lash and the tax-collector; and doubtless to remember that they were fighting under the eyes of their wives and children. (iii.) The appeal merged into a peroration (*καταπλέξας τὴν ῥῆσιν*), in which no doubt the gods and heroes were invoked, and Marathon, 'the trophies of Miltiades,' even Artemision, probably were not forgotten. The whole speech left upon the hearers' minds the sense of confidence, courage, ability, intellectual force. One misses from the brief report two points, which will hardly have been absent in the actual harangue: some estimate of the opponents and their chances, and some hints of the actual tactics to be pursued.

7. **ἐσβαίνειν ἐκέλευε ἐς τὰς νέας**: doubtless before or after the speech they had breakfast on shore, and were better off than the Persians in this respect.

8. **οὗτοι μέν**: there is no antithetical *δέ* unless it be found somewhat incongruously in *ἀναγομένοισι δέ* below.

ἐσέβαινον καὶ ἧκε: long before they were done embarking the trireme from Aigina was come, which had left the ranks (*ἀπεδήμησε*, cp. c. 41 *supra*) for the purpose of summoning, invoking, (and bringing) the Aiakids to the aid of Hellas (c. 64 *supra*). Presumably the trireme brought the images. But at what point exactly did it reappear in the ranks? If its arrival is to be dated in the morning, after the speech of Themistokles, how did it make its way through the enemy, where Aristeides had barely got through, even under cover of night? Is this trireme any other than the vessel of Aristeides? Was not he the envoy despatched to Aigina, from which he returned in c. 79 *supra*?

84. 2. **ἀνῆγον τὰς νέας ἁπάσας**: advanced (or were advancing) their ships *en masse*; but before the movement was complete (**ἀναγομένοισι δέ σφι**), indeed while it was little more than begun (**αὐτίκα**), they found themselves attacked by the barbarians (**ἐπεκέατο οἱ β.**). Our whole conception of the actual engagement must turn upon the true interpretation of these words. They look simple enough, but their meaning is obscure. At first sight they might seem to lend themselves to Leake's interpretation of the movements recorded in cc. 70, 76 *supra*; the Greek fleet advances out of the bay of *Ambelaki*, and finds itself at once involved, front to front, with the king's fleet, which has also advanced to attack. But if that were the situation, the two fleets would have been in full view of each other all along since the first streak of dawn; and the element of surprise, involved in these words, is inexplicable. The Greeks are taken

ἐπεκέατο οἱ βάρβαροι. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες ἐπὶ πρύμνην ἀνεκρούοντο καὶ ὤκελλον τὰς νέας, Ἀμεινίης δὲ Παλληνεὺς ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος ἐξαναχθεὶς νηὶ ἐμβάλλει· συμπλακείσης δὲ τῆς νεὸς καὶ οὐ δυναμένων ἀπαλλαγῆναι, οὕτω δὴ οἱ ἄλλοι

3 ἐπὶ del. Bekker, Holder, van H. 4 ἀνέκρουόν τε Eltz || καὶ . . νέας suspecta hab. Krueger, van H. || ὤκελον *z* || νῆας *z* || Παλληνεὺς om. Marc.: del. Cobet, Holder, van H. 5 συμπλεκείσης A^1BC 6 νῆος *z*

aback: before their own movement is complete they find the barbarians in motion against them. Nothing of that sort could have arisen on Leake's hypothesis. Granted that Hdt. so conceived the matter: but what sense is there in saying of two fleets, moving upon each other, front to front, that the one fleet advanced to the attack, and, while it was advancing, the other fleet attacked it? Such a statement is only intelligible on the supposition of a flank engagement. If the Greek fleet was emerging from the bay of *Ambelaki* just at the same moment as the Persian fleet was entering the straits, such a situation might arise: either the Greek fleet might cut the Persian column, somewhere behind its leading ships, or the head of the Persian column might strike the extreme right of the Greek fleet *en flanc.* If the Persian column were two or three ships abreast, or if there were two or more Persian columns — the one column perhaps pressing in between Psyttaleia and the island of Salamis, the other between Psyttaleia and the Attic mainland — a more complicated situation might easily arise: the extreme right of the Greek wing might be taken *en flanc*, or involved with the left column of the Persian advance, while the right Persian column might have to advance much further before becoming engaged with the Greek left. If such was, indeed, the whole situation adumbrated in this chapter, it is possible that the engagement opened, that actual contact with the enemy was effected, sooner than Themistokles intended or could have wished: he must have desired a large number of the Persian vessels to enter the straits before the actual fighting began.

3. **οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες**: other than 'the Athenians,' or other than the one Athenian named? The latter is an absurd supposition: Themistokles and the other Athenian Strategoi knew what they were about, and were not likely 'to back water'—unless, indeed, the action of Ameinias of Pallene was ill-advised and premature. That the Greek right wing backed water (**πρύμνην ἀνεκρούοντο**), and, of course, by order, is likely enough; the Greeks on the right were much nearer the advancing enemy. That they were actually for beaching their ships (**ὤκελλον**) is probably a bit of popular (Attic) scandal, started by the man in the street, or the A.B. in the fleet, who did not understand what was going on or the tactics of the admirals.

4. **Ἀμεινίης δὲ Παλληνεύς**: this Ameinias was, according to Diodoros 11. 27. 2, the brother of the poet Aischylos (who was an Eleusinian), cp. 6. 114, and according to Plutarch, *Themist.* 14, of the deme of Dekeleia, cp. 9. 73 *infra* (not of Pallene). The deme Pallene (site of the temple of Athene Παλληνίς, cp. 1. 62) belonged to the tribe Antiochis, and lay on the spurs of Hymettos crossed by the road to Marathon. Ameinias is not an uncommon name, and Aischylos, *Pers.* 409, does nothing for his supposed brother's claim, though he supports the Athenian claim by making a Phoenician ship implicated. The addition of the *Demotikon* here, if genuine, without the patronymic, would betray the Attic source, even without the express statement just below, **Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὕτω λέγουσι**, but it rather conflicts with ἀν. Ἀθ. and may be an interpellation; cp. App. Crit.

5. **ἐξαναχθείς**: passive in form, middle in force; cp. 7. 194 *supra* (of ships, not of shipmasters); "longius evectus," Baehr. This chapter exhibits the verb ἀνάγειν in all three voices.

νηί might be his own (instrumental) or an enemy's (objective), probably the latter; cp. ἐνέβαλε νηὶ φιλίῃ, c. 87 *infra*. **τῆς νεός** is his own. **οὐ δυναμένων**, sc. τῶν τοῦ Ἀμεινίου.

Ἀμεινίῃ βοηθέοντες συνέμισγον. Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὕτω λέγουσι τῆς ναυμαχίης γενέσθαι τὴν ἀρχήν, Αἰγινῆται δὲ τὴν κατὰ τοὺς Αἰακίδας ἀποδημήσασαν ἐς Αἴγιναν, ταύτην εἶναι τὴν ἄρξασαν. λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε, ὡς φάσμα σφι γυναικὸς ἐφάνη, φανεῖσαν δὲ διακελεύσασθαι ὥστε καὶ ἅπαν ἀκοῦσαι τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στρατόπεδον, ὀνειδίσασαν πρότερον τάδε, "ὦ δαιμόνιοι, μέχρι κόσου ἔτι πρύμνην ἀνακρούσεσθε;"

85 Κατὰ μὲν δὴ Ἀθηναίους ἐτετάχατο Φοίνικες (οὗτοι γὰρ

---

8 *γενέσθαι τῆς ναυμαχίης z* 11 *τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Ἑλλήνων z* 13 *ἀνακρούσεσθε* (*remos inhibebitis*) Valla, Holder, van H., Stein³: *ἀνακρούεσθε*

---

8. **Αἰγινῆται δέ**: plainly a rival tradition. If the Athenians were on the extreme left, and the Aiginetans on the right, and the situation was such as above indicated, each claim may have been made in good faith, but the Aiginetan was more probably the true one. Whether it was the ship that had been away for the Aiakids, which was actually the first engaged, may be more doubtful: it is such a happily ominous detail. The ship in question is clearly assumed to have been an Aiginetan; but Aristeides might have taken a berth in it.

10. **λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε** comes in well to remind us on what slender threads these λόγοι hang! The **φάσμα** here is nothing if not superhuman (cp. c. 94 *infra*); her voice alone is enough to prove that! Of the actual and living women and children, who, like enough, were lining the shores of Salamis and making the welkin ring, Hdt. says nothing.

11. **διακελεύσασθαι**: cp. c. 80 *supra*.

τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στρατόπεδον seems here used of the navy alone and at sea; but there was a laager on shore which cannot have been wholly deserted, and perhaps this λόγος came from that quarter. Cp. c. 10. 14 *supra*.

12. **δαιμόνιοι**, 'wretches,' 'luckless wights'; cp. 7. 48 *supra*.

85. 1. **κατὰ μὲν δὴ Ἀθηναίους . . Φοίνικες**: the Phoenician vessels were presumably on the right of the Persian line—if the Persian fleet was in line formation in accordance with Leake's hypothesis—or they were at the head of the column (probably three ships abreast, see Appendix VI. § 4), if the Persian fleet was entering the straits in column (the only conceivable formation for such a manœuvre): in either case they might be described vaguely as holding **τὸ πρὸς Ἐλευσῖνός τε καὶ ἑσπέρης κέρας**, albeit undoubtedly this expression here squares best with the projection of the battle lines on Leake's plan. (If there were not a good deal in the text of Hdt. to suggest that plan it would never have been heard of.) It is the eminent merit of Professor W. W. Goodwin's paper, *Papers Amer. Sch. Ath.* i. 1885, 239 ff. (cp. Appendix VI. § 3) to have shown that the (natural) identification of *τὸ πρὸς Ἐλευσῖνός τε καὶ ἑσπέρης κέρας* in this place with *τὸ ἀπ' ἑσπέρης κέρας* in c. 76 *supra* is not necessary, and on a rational conception of the manœuvres of the Persian fleet is, indeed, impossible. It by no means follows that Hdt. intended to distinguish them, or even clearly and consciously faced the problem of the identity or difference between them. Hdt. reported each movement in terms of his authorities, his sources; he had perhaps written a preliminary sketch or draft of the battle-piece before he ever saw the landscape: at no time did he compose an explicit, coherent, or relatively complete account. It was inevitable that Goodwin's suggestion should be challenged and discarded, in the forlorn hope of rehabilitating Hdt. as a competent war-correspondent; see 'Herodotus's Account of the Battle of Salamis,' by Pres. B. I. Wheeler in *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.* xxxiii. 1902, 127 ff. That kind of apology is hardly possible for students of Hdt. who deal with the work as a whole, and have realized the relation of Hdt. to his sources and the canons of his logography.

In strictest accuracy the wing, or column, towards Eleusis could not be the west wing: Eleusis is about due

εἶχον τὸ πρὸς Ἐλευσῖνός τε καὶ ἑσπέρης κέρας), κατὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίους Ἴωνες· οὗτοι δ' εἶχον τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ τε καὶ τὸν Πειραιέα. ἐθελοκάκεον μέντοι αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰς Θεμι-

85. 2 πρὸς Σαλαμῖνός Loeschke 3 δὲ **B** 4 αὐτέων z

north of 'Old Salamis,' and NNW. of Psyttaleia. But in entering the straits the Persian fleet would have been steering almost due west, and Eleusis would be ahead of it. The description is not one which should be found fault with under the circumstances: both its factors may be strictly true, not in relation to each other, but in relation to the Phoenician ships that fine morning—whether they were heading into the straits, or lying with their sterns towards the Attic coast off Mount *Skaramanga* (Aigaleos) and their stems to the bay of Salamis.

In either case the Athenians appear to be on the Greek left. This was the position which their hoplites occupied afterwards in the battle of Plataia, and the right wing was the natural place for the hegemonic state, or commander, to occupy (cp. 'the *prytaneia*' of Miltiades, and the position of the polemarch at Marathon: 6. 110, 111). The tactics of land-fighting were naturally transferred to the naval war. At Artemision, however, the Athenians had occupied apparently the right. There the Spartans wished to be in more immediate touch with Leonidas: the right was there also the post of danger; the Attic ships at Chalkis might be regarded as holding the extreme left (for the time being). In their own waters it may have been galling for the Athenians to hold the left; but Themistokles might gladly acquiesce in the inner station, which made a retreat for the Peloponnesians doubly difficult. It is, indeed, conceivable that had the Peloponnesian vessels at any time actually attempted to fly past the Athenian station, the barbarians might have enjoyed the spectacle of the Greeks πρὸς ἑωυτοὺς ναυμαχέοντας — promised, or threatened, by Themistokles, *pro bono publico*, in c. 75 *supra*.

3. **τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ τε καὶ τὸν Πειραιέα.** Why Hdt. here substitutes the Peiraieus (an ἅπαξ λ. in his work!) for Munichia in c. 76 *supra* is an obscure problem, the solution of which might depend on the complete disclosure of the mystery of his sources. From the straits of Salamis (as W. W. Goodwin *l.c.* p. 252 n. observes) "the harbour of Peiraieus and all the lower land of the peninsula almost disappears from view, and the high hill of Munichia remains a most conspicuous landmark." The passage here before us, then, may come from a source, possibly even an 'Ionian' source, which was not looking back from the straits of Salamis, but was outside the straits, on sea, or even on land, and thought of Eleusis (quite invisible) and Peiraieus naturally as lying west and east.

If the conception above given of the manœuvres of the Persian fleet during the night be correct, it will appear probable that the Ionians in the first instance occupied the centre of the Persian lines—a position in which it would perhaps have been more difficult for them ἐθελοκακέειν. When the Persian position was developed, and altered, the Egyptians on the left being detached to circumnavigate the island and to block the Megarian channel, and the remainder moved up between Psyttaleia and the island on the one hand, the Attic shore on the other, the Ionian contingent may have occupied the left, or left centre of the Persian lines. In the morning when the Phoenician vessels entered the straits in column, and the Ionians swung round to follow, they would become the rear of the advancing column, and might easily extend back as far as the Peiraieus. But 'Peiraieus' may be here used almost as laxly in relation to actual orientation as 'Eleusis' just above. It would, however, be absolutely wrong and misleading if the Persian fleet were still drawn up in battle-array on the lines from the Attic coast through Psyttaleia to Keos-Kynosura; the left would then have been furthest from Peiraieus, and the right (i.e. the Phoenicians) furthest from Eleusis. Of all modern theories of the battle-lines at Salamis this one is the most difficult to reconcile with the authorities, Hdt. included, and with common sense.

4. **τὰς Θεμιστοκλέος ἐντολάς:** an implicit reference back to c. 22 *supra*.

στοκλέος ἐντολὰς ὀλίγοι, οἱ δὲ πλεῦνες οὔ. ἔχω μέν νυν συχνῶν οὐνόματα τριηράρχων καταλέξαι τῶν νέας Ἑλληνίδας ἑλόντων, χρήσομαι δὲ αὐτοῖσι οὐδὲν πλὴν Θεομήστορός τε τοῦ Ἀνδροδάμαντος καὶ Φυλάκου τοῦ Ἱστιαίου, Σαμίων ἀμφοτέρων. τοῦδε δὲ εἵνεκα μέμνημαι τούτων μούνων, ὅτι Θεομήστωρ μὲν διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον Σάμου ἐτυράννευσε καταστησάντων τῶν Περσέων, Φύλακος δὲ εὐεργέτης βασιλέος ἀνεγράφη καὶ χώρῃ ἐδωρήθη πολλῇ. οἱ δ' εὐεργέται βασιλέος ὀροσάγγαι καλέονται περσιστί.

86 περὶ μέν νυν τούτους οὕτω εἶχε· τὸ δὲ πλῆθος τῶν νεῶν ἐν τῇ Σαλαμῖνι ἐκεραΐζετο, αἱ μὲν ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων

6 νῆας z 7 θεμήστορός B : θεομίστορός C 9 τοῦδε δὲ Reiske : τοῦ δὲ AB : τοῦ, δὲ CPS : τοῦδε Rz || τουτέων z || μόνων **B** 11 βασιλῆος z || χώρηι P, Stein[2], van H.: χώρῃ ceteri, Stein[1], Holder : χώρῃ οἱ z 12 πολλῆι P, Stein[2], van H. : πολλή || οἱ δ' . . περσιστί. Nonne glossema delendum? || τοῦ βασιλῆος z **86.** 1 οὕτω : τοῦτο B 2 νηῶν z || ὑπὸ CRz

5. **ἔχω μέν νυν . . ἑλόντων**: this remarkable statement seems to support the suggestion that in this place Hdt. is not following Athenian or Spartan sources, but authorities which were to be found on the Asianic side; the particulars he gives are of obvious Samian provenience, perhaps even backed by a Persian countersign! **τριηράρχων** is used without any suggestion of Attic institutes.

7. **Θεομήστορός τε τοῦ Ἀνδροδάμαντος**: his establishment as 'tyrant' in Samos (cp. case of Koës of Mytilene 5. 11) immediately succeeded his services; cp. 9. 90 *infra*. The name Theomestor is rare, perhaps unique, certainly magnificent; his father's name (not noticed in Pauly, or in Pauly-Wissowa), hardly less so, is known from Aristotle (*Pol.* 2. 12. 14 = 1274 B) as that of a legislator of Rhegion (possibly the same man), and from Pausanias (2. 6. 6, 7. 6, 12. 6) as the mythical son of Chthonophyle (of Sikyon) by Phlias, son of Dionysos!

8. **Φυλάκου τοῦ Ἱστιαίου**: Phylakos is the name of a 'Delphian' hero, c. 39 *supra*, *u.v.*, but is apparently unique as the name of an historical person. His father's name, Histiaios, is found in Hdt. at Termera, cp. 7. 98 *supra*, and at Miletos, cp. 7. 10 *supra*. If the great Milesian tyrant had really been a Samian, or of Samian extraction (so in fifteenth century Michael Apostolios 16. 81 *ap.* Pape-Benseler), would Hdt. have failed to let us know?

11. **εὐεργέτης βασιλέος ἀνεγράφη**: no doubt in the Royal Archives, but the fact might have stood recorded in an inscription, and at Samos. Unfortunately Hdt. does not specify where the man's great landed possessions were situated. On such rewards cp. 9. 107 *infra*. On ἀνεγράφη Blakesley well compares Plato *Gorgias* 132, and Stein *C.I.G.* 84, where ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ is added.

12. **οἱ δ' εὐεργέται β. ὀροσάγγαι κ. περσιστί.** If not a gloss—it has a great look of one—this remark is evidence in support of the early composition of these Books, for in 3. 140 is an anecdote of a Samian benefactor to Dareios, where the explanation would more naturally have come in; and this, indeed, a glossator might have observed as well as the author. The word ὀρ. is interpreted σωματοφύλακες βασιλέως by Hesych. and Photius, and apparently used in that sense by Sophokles *Fr.* 185, and Stein has a derivation accordingly, ὀρο = VAR, to keep ('ware') — σαγγ = *Khshâyata* (Shah!). Sir H. Rawlinson *ap.* Rawlinson *ad l.* connected it with *khur*, 'worthy,' *sansa* = Zend *sañgha*, 'to praise'; Benfey and Oppert had other forms.

86. 2. **ἐν τῇ Σαλαμῖνι** is rather a curious way of describing the locality; it seems to lay the scene at least between Salamis and the mainland; the battle has always and everywhere been named by the Hellenic base.

ἐκεραΐζετο: the verb (κεραΐζειν, cp.

διαφθειρόμεναι αἱ δὲ ὑπ' Αἰγινητέων. ἅτε γὰρ τῶν μὲν Ἑλλήνων σὺν κόσμῳ ναυμαχεόντων <καὶ> κατὰ τάξιν, τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων οὔτε τεταγμένων ἔτι οὔτε σὺν νόῳ ποιεόντων οὐδέν, ἔμελλε τοιοῦτό σφι συνοίσεσθαι οἷόν περ ἀπέβη. καίτοι ἦσάν γε καὶ ἐγένοντο ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην μακρῷ ἀμείνονες αὐτοὶ ἑωυτῶν ἢ πρὸς Εὐβοίῃ, πᾶς τις προθυμεόμενος καὶ δειμαίνων Ξέρξην, ἐδόκεέ τε ἕκαστος ἑωυτὸν θεήσασθαι βασιλέα.

Κατὰ *μὲν δὴ τοὺς ἄλλους οὐκ ἔχω [μετεξετέρους] εἰπεῖν* **87**
ἀτρεκέως ὡς ἕκαστοι τῶν βαρβάρων ἢ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἠγωνί-

---

4 *καὶ* addidit Stein² || *κατὰ τάξιν* del. Cobet 5 *οὔτε* Baiter : *οὐ* 6 *ἤμελλε* **αβ**P || *τοιοῦτόν* **β** 7 *ἔσαν* z 9 *τε* : *τοι* B || *θεήσασθαι* CP : *θεήσεσθαι* z : *θηήσασθαι* vel *θηήσεσθαι* **87.** 1 *μετεξετέρους* secl. Stein, Holder, van H. || *εἶπαι* z, van H. 2 *ὡς* om. C

---

1. 88, 159, 2. 115, 121) is used rather (in its Homeric sense) to mean 'plundering' than merely 'destroying'; but cp. 7. 125 *supra*. We recur here, with the Athenians and Aiginetans, to the chief rival sources of c. 84 above.

3. **ἅτε γὰρ τῶν μὲν Ἑλλήνων**: the term is applied here only to those on the national side (cp. 7. 149 etc., cc. 111, 121, 132 *infra*); cp. *Ἑλληνίς* c. 87 *infra*, also *Ἑλλήνων* c. 89.

4. **σὺν κόσμῳ** is more or less reproduced just below by **σὺν νόῳ**, and **κατὰ τάξιν** is paralleled by **τεταγμένων ἔτι**, the two merits affirmed of the Greeks, denied of 'the barbarians,' albeit hitherto the Phoenicians have been admittedly 'better sailors'; cp. c. 10 *supra*, while the exploits of sundry Greeks on the Persian side, recorded below, cc. 87, 90, seem to declare a certain degree of *νοῦς*. *κοσμός* Stein refers to (*a*) the command of individual ships, (*b*) the general discipline of crews, etc.; *τάξις* to manœuvres of divisions, each ship keeping its own place, etc., perhaps a little hypercritically; *κόσμος* particularly need not be denied of the *ensemble*.

6. **ἔμελλε**, 'was bound,' 'was sure' . . **συνοίσεσθαι** and **ἀπέβη** mark a distinction without a difference; the *συμφορά* comes more home than the *ἀποβάν*, and the two words denote one and the same event looked at as it came home to the person, or as it 'went off' in its natural order or sequence.

7. **ἦσάν γε καὶ ἐγένοντο κτλ.** Hdt. apparently says two things in one sentence: *ἦσαν ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην* (acc. of time; cp. Index) *ἀμείνονες ἑωυτῶν*, i.e. they surpassed themselves, cp. 5. 118; and *ἐγένοντο ἀμείνονες ἢ πρὸς Εὐβοίῃ*. 2. 25 *αὐτὸς ἑωυτοῦ ῥέει πολλῷ ὑποδεέστερος ἢ τοῦ θέρεος* is not an exact parallel, as there is only one verb in that passage. But the double redundance here is not unnatural, and the alternative does not so much lie between *ἦσαν* and *ἐγένοντο* as between *αὐτοὶ ἑωυτῶν* and *ἢ πρὸς Εὐβοίῃ*—the extra verb rather eases this alternative. There is a clear though general reference back to the account of the sea-fights off Artemision, cc. 6–17 *supra*, as in the words with which the chapter concludes back to c. 69 *supra*. Such implicit references are natural in a work composed for a reading public.

9. **ἐδόκεέ τε . .**: this sentence is coordinate grammatically not with the preceding participles, but with the principal verbs *ἦσάν γε καὶ ἐγένοντο* above. **θεήσασθαι**: the aorist is observable; each was feeling that the king saw him —the king's eye was on him. (It might be for a moment—any moment; but that would be enough!)

87. 1. **κατά**: c. 85 *supra*, l. 1, purely locative; there again, l. 4, sequent, or consequent (*κατὰ τὰς ἐντολάς*); here, thirdly, respective, *quod attinet ad* . .

οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως: a confession of the failure of his sources. What the historian apparently regrets is the lack of heroic anecdote; strategic, tactical details do not much preoccupy him.

2. **ἕκαστοι**: not individual men, but,

ζοντο· κατὰ δὲ Ἀρτεμισίην τάδε ἐγένετο, ἀπ᾽ ὧν εὐδοκίμησε μᾶλλον ἔτι παρὰ βασιλέι. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐς θόρυβον πολλὸν ἀπίκετο τὰ βασιλέος πρήγματα, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἡ νηῦς ἡ Ἀρτεμισίης ἐδιώκετο ὑπὸ νεὸς Ἀττικῆς· καὶ ἣ οὐκ ἔχουσα διαφυγεῖν, ἔμπροσθε γὰρ αὐτῆς ἦσαν ἄλλαι νέες φίλιαι, ἡ δὲ αὐτῆς πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων μάλιστα ἐτύγχανε ἐοῦσα, ἔδοξέ οἱ τόδε ποιῆσαι, τὸ καὶ συνήνεικε ποιησάσῃ· διωκομένη γὰρ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀττικῆς φέρουσα ἐνέβαλε νηὶ φιλίῃ ἀνδρῶν τε Καλυνδέων καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιπλέοντος τοῦ Καλυνδέων βασιλέος

4 βασιλῆι z : βασιλεῖ || ἐπεὶ γὰρ z 5 βασιλῆος z 6 ναῦς **B** || νεὼς (νηὸς z) || ἣ **B** 7 ἔμπροσθεν **B**z || ἔσαν z || νῆες z 9 συνήνεγκε **a** 10 τε : δὲ ? Kallenberg **11** ἐπιπλώοντος van H. || βασιλῆος z

as always, individual sets of men, contingents, etc.

3. **Ἀρτεμισίην**: Hdt.'s countrywoman, concerning whom he might naturally have fuller information, especially of a personal kind, from the first. There is a clear implicit reference in **μᾶλλον ἔτι** back to c. 69 *supra*; cp. last chapter. Note the use of ἔτι with the comparative; it clearly does not stand for ἤδη.

4. **ἐς θόρυβον π. ἀπίκετο τὰ β. πρήγματα**: θόρυβος, confusion; cp. c. 90 *infra*. ἐς θ. ἀπίκετο (aor.) = ἐθορυβήθη. πρήγματα: cp. c. 75 *supra*.

6. **ἐδιώκετο ὑπὸ ν. Ἀττικῆς**, which turns out afterwards (c. 93 *infra*) to be the ship of Ameinias! (On the Asianic side they would not have known the Attic trierarch's name.) **ἥ** demonstrative: of the lady, not of the ship.

7. **ἔμπροσθε γὰρ αὐτῆς ἦσαν ἄλλαι νέες φ.** Had Artemisia already gone about, and was she in flight, heading out for Phaleron or the open sea? If so, her course is embarrassed by the Persian reserves, which filled all the fare-way to Munichia; c. 76 *infra*. But it is possible that ἔμπροσθε refers to vessels ahead of her in the Persian column, i.e. west of her; that the Attic squadron had partially headed round the Phoenician ships; and that Ameinias was driving in upon Artemisia from the further side, east (or north). Cp. c. 89 *infra*, ἐς τὸ πρόσθε, etc. By this time the lines are rather mixed; Artemisia will have been in the centre originally (cp. c. 85 *supra*), and perhaps on the left, or in the rear, of the Persian line or column, after the development of the Persian position; if an Athenian vessel now pursues her, the Greek left has already pushed out beyond Psyttaleia; or, if Ameinias was posted not on the extreme left, but on the extreme right of the Athenian position, then he is attacking Artemisia from the right, i.e. west side (or south).

8. **ἡ δὲ αὐτῆς**: sc. νηῦς. The position here indicated suggests that Artemisia's ship might just be clear of Psyttaleia; but Hdt.'s locatives are too vague for us to credit him with any clear vision of the situation. The **πολέμιοι** here must be the 'Hellenes.'

9. **ἔδοξέ οἱ**: a change of construction, anacoluthon, which leaves ἣ οὐκ ἔχουσα *pendens*; an exact parallel in 7. 177 *supra*.

συνήνεικε here carries an unusually pregnant sense, 'succeeded,' 'turned out well'; cp. 9. 37 *infra*, and contr. cc. 88, 90 *infra*. The success in question is the remote, not the immediate result of the manœuvre. (**ποιησάσῃ**, 'after she had done it.')

10. **φέρουσα ἐνέβαλε νηὶ φιλίῃ**: the principal verb might be used more naturally of the ship (cp. c. 90 *infra*) than of the lady, and the active participle (cp. φερομένη *et sim.*, cc. 90, 91, 9. 102 *infra*) is also remarkable: perhaps a compliment to this careering woman.

11. **Καλυνδέων . . Δαμασιθύμου.** The 'Kalyndeans' of this passage are hardly other folk than the 'Kalydnians' of 7. 99 *supra* (*u.v.*), nor can Damasithymos, their *Basileus*, be other than Damasithymos, son of Kandaules, of 7. 98 *supra*. Hdt. might seem, indeed, to have meant

Δαμασιθύμου. εἰ μὲν καί τι νεῖκος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐγεγόνεε ἔτι περὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἐόντων, οὐ μέντοι ἔχω γε εἰπεῖν οὔτε εἰ ἐκ προνοίης αὐτὰ ἐποίησε, οὔτε εἰ συνεκύρησε ἡ τῶν Καλυνδέων κατὰ τύχην παραπεσοῦσα [νηῦς]. ὡς δὲ ἐνέβαλέ τε καὶ κατέδυσε, εὐτυχίῃ χρησαμένη διπλᾶ ἑωυτὴν ἀγαθὰ ἐργάσατο. ὅ τε γὰρ τῆς Ἀττικῆς νεὸς τριήραρχος ὡς εἶδέ μιν ἐμβάλλουσαν νηὶ ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων, νομίσας τὴν νέα τὴν Ἀρτεμισίης ἢ Ἑλληνίδα εἶναι ἢ αὐτομολέειν ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ αὐτοῖσι ἀμύνειν, ἀποστρέψας πρὸς ἄλλας ἐτράπετο. τοῦτο μὲν **88**

---

12 *δαμασύθου* R 13 *εἶπαι* z, van H. 15 *κατατυχεῖν* B ‖ *νηῦς* secl. Stein[3] ‖ *ἐνέβαλλέ* C 17 *νεὼς* A : *νηὸς* z 18 *νῆα* z

---

two different states, two different persons; but the variant forms, if both genuine, may be ascribed to various sources, and the failure to refer from the one passage to the other to Hdt.'s *insouciance*, his independence in composition. **ἐπιπλέοντος**: cp. 7. 97 *supra*.

12. **εἰ μὲν καί τι νεῖκος κτλ.**: this passage implicitly indicates that some authorities, some source (Stein says 'some other' *Geschichtschreiber*, logographer?) had a story of a quarrel between Artemisia and Damasithymos, 'while the forces were "still" (**ἔτι**) in the Hellespontine region,' i.e. just before the transit of the Hellespont. Perhaps the locality is not so certain as the suggested date, i.e. before the Persian forces crossed into Europe. (It is at least doubtful whether Artemisia and Damasithymos were on the Hellespont at all; cp. 7. 44, 59.) Hdt. has here lost a golden chance! What was the cause of the *νεῖκος*? Was it a woman's reason—*spretae iniuria formae*? Or a man's ambition? Damasithymos might ill brook the 'hegemonia' of the Halikarnassian queen! Was the mother anxious for the succession of her boy? Was the Karian dynast intriguing against the *Mutter-recht*? (cp. p. 126a *supra*). There are all the elements of a romance, a tragedy, or at least a melodrama, behind this passing allusion: had the subject been already too well handled for Hdt. to retouch it? He repeats instead his formula of despair, *οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν*.

14. **ἐκ προνοίης**, *de industria*, of set purpose, deliberately.

αὐτά, 'it,' we should say. Cp. 7. 8 *ἐν αὐτοῖσι*.

συνεκύρησε: so c. 92 *infra*, *συνεκύρεον νέες*. In a more abstract sense, 9. 90 *infra*.

15. **κατὰ τύχην παραπεσοῦσα.** Hdt. has forgotten that the ship of Damasithymos was one of the five ships led by Artemisia, 7. 99 *supra*; there can have been very little 'chance' in the fact that it was stationed close by the queen's ship, and so came first in her way. *παραπεσοῦσα*, cp. Plato *Rep.* 561 B *ἡ παραπίπτουσα ἀεὶ ἡδονή*. **ἐργάσατο**, with double accus.; cp. c. 79 *supra*.

17. **ὁ . . τριήραρχος**: namely, Ameinias. His views (**νομίσας**) may be matter of conjecture. **μιν**: sc. *τὴν γυναῖκα*.

18. **ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων**: Karians, to wit; cp. c. 135 *infra*. **ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων**, more generally.

20. **αὐτοῖσι**, sc. *τοῖσι Ἕλλησι*, 'his countrymen.' Krueger asserts that *ἑωυτοῖσι* would be 'more correct' (*gehöriger*), cp. c. 61 *supra*. Abicht observes that, owing to the proximity of *τὴν νέα* (i.e. as Subject), *ἑωυτοῖσι* could only refer to 'the Persians' (i.e. *τοῖσι βαρβάροισι*). Stein rules that "Hdt. employs the Reflexive (pronoun) in regard to the more remote Subject (here *τριήραρχος*) only when the nearer Subject (here *τὴν νέα*) follows after"; or, as we might say: *If a fresh subject intervene between the subject of a sentence and the verb, Hdt. substitutes the Personal for the Reflexive pronoun to describe a Reflexive relation between the main Subject and its verb;* for the simple reason that (as Stein elsewhere suggests), the interposition of the fresh Subject would eclipse, or obscure, the direct relation of the Reflexive pronoun; cp. 1. 111 *ἡ δὲ γυνὴ (ἐν φροντίδι ἦν) ὅ τι οὐκ ἐωθὼς ὁ*

τοιοῦτο αὐτῇ συνήνεικε γενέσθαι <ὥστε> διαφυγεῖν τε καὶ μὴ ἀπολέσθαι, τοῦτο δὲ συνέβη ὥστε κακὸν ἐργασαμένην ἀπὸ τούτων αὐτὴν μάλιστα εὐδοκιμῆσαι παρὰ Ξέρξῃ. λέγεται γὰρ βασιλέα θηεύμενον μαθεῖν τὴν νέα ἐμβαλοῦσαν, καὶ δή τινα εἰπεῖν τῶν παρεόντων "δέσποτα, ὁρᾷς Ἀρτεμισίην ὡς εὖ ἀγωνίζεται καὶ νέα τῶν πολεμίων κατέδυσε;" καὶ τὸν ἐπειρέσθαι εἰ ἀληθέως ἐστὶ Ἀρτεμισίης τὸ ἔργον, καὶ τοὺς φάναι, σαφέως τὸ ἐπίσημον τῆς νεὸς ἐπισταμένους· τὴν δὲ διαφθαρεῖσαν ἠπιστέατο εἶναι πολεμίην. τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα, ὡς εἴρηται, αὐτῇ συνήνεικε ἐς εὐτυχίην γενόμενα, καὶ τὸ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Καλυνδικῆς νεὸς μηδένα ἀποσωθέντα κατήγορον γενέσθαι. Ξέρξην δὲ εἰπεῖν λέγεται πρὸς τὰ φραζόμενα "οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες

---

88. 2 *τοιοῦτον* 𝔅 ‖ *ὥστε* coni. Stein[2] ‖ *διαφυγέειν* codd. *z* 4 *τουτέων z* 5 *βασιλῆα z*: *βασιλέα τε*? Stein[2] ‖ *νῆα z* ‖ *ἐμβαλλοῦσαν* C: *ἐμβάλλουσαν* Naber 6 *εἰπεῖν* om. C: *εἶπαι z*, van H. 7 <*ἢ*> *καὶ* Naber ‖ *νῆα z* 9 *σαφῶς* P*z* ‖ *νεὼς* 𝔅: *νηὸς z* 11 *συνήνεικε* P*z*: *συνήνεικεν* ‖ *ἐς* om. C 12 *νηὸς z* ‖ *ἀπωσθέντα* C 13 *εἶπαι z*, van H.

Ἅρπαγος μεταπέμψαιτο αὐτῆς τὸν ἄνδρα, 1. 146 (*σφέων τοὺς πατέρας*), 2. 121 (*αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλήν*). But the plural *αὐτοῖσι* here, after the singular subject, resembles the use of *ἑωυτοῖσι l.c. supra*.

88. 1. **τοῦτο μὲν . . τοῦτο δέ**, 'in the first place . . in the second place'; cp. Index for reff.

3. **κακὸν ἐργασαμένην αὐτὴν μάλιστα εὐδοκιμῆσαι παρὰ Ξέρξῃ**: there is a dash of malicious humour at the expense both of the queen and of the king. **ἀπὸ τούτων** is superfluous, and the plural vague; the preposition here is scarcely temporal, but rather causal.

4. **λέγεται γάρ**: Grote questions the sequel of Artemisia's exploit (**ἔργον**); Rawlinson fails to see why. There is reason enough in that Hdt. himself questions it, as he shows by the three apologetic references to the source (**λέγεται** *bis*, **φασί** *ad fin.*).

6. **τινα**: hardly a Greek, presumably a Persian, who knew no better; but the **τούς** below (like **τόν** demonstrative) might well refer to Greeks.

9. **τὸ ἐπίσημον τῆς νεός**: cp. *τὸ σημήιον* c. 92 *infra*. Polyainos, 8. 53. 1, says Artemisia varied her 'ensigns,' sometimes showing Greek and sometimes Persian colours. Rawlinson regards that as the refinement of a later age, such ensigns not existing in 480 B.C., the figure-head, which could not be changed at pleasure, being the only ensign; cp. 3. 59 (which cannot prove a negative!). But the admiral's ensign can hardly have been a figure-head. "Flags are represented at the sterns of the Athenian ships of about 500 B.C.," Torr, *Ancient Ships*, p. 100.

ἐπισταμένους, like *μαθεῖν* just above, of sensible perception, and so more than *ἐπιστήμη*, followed by **ἠπιστέατο** meaning 'believed'—something less than *ἐπιστήμη* (a word not used by Hdt.). The psychological terminology of Hdt. is in a rudimentary stage; cp. his use of the words *θυμός, νόος, φρήν, φρόνημα, ψυχή, διάνοια, μαθεῖν, ἐπίστασθαι*, etc.

10. **ὡς εἴρηται**, just above, a reference back but of a few lines. **συνήνεικε ἐς εὐτυχίην γενόμενα** recurs through **συνήνεικε γενέσθαι** l. 1, to the **συνήνεικε** in c. 87 *supra*, which was used there with much the same meaning as the fuller expression here.

12. **μηδένα ἀποσωθέντα κατήγορον γενέσθαι**: the participle is here essentially a part of the predicate; the meaning clearly being, not that none of the survivors impeached her, but that there were no survivors, and so no impeachment.

13. **οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες κτλ.**: the remark was borrowed from (or by) Artemisia, cp. c. 68 *supra*; it comes better from the lips of Xerxes.

γεγόνασί μοι γυναῖκες, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες." ταῦτα μὲν Ξέρξην φασὶ εἰπεῖν.

89 Ἐν δὲ τῷ πόνῳ τούτῳ ἀπὸ μὲν ἔθανε ὁ στρατηγὸς Ἀριαβίγνης ὁ Δαρείου, Ξέρξεω ἐὼν ἀδελφεός, ἀπὸ δὲ ἄλλοι πολλοί τε καὶ ὀνομαστοὶ Περσέων καὶ Μήδων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων, ὀλίγοι δὲ τινὲς καὶ Ἑλλήνων· ἅτε γὰρ νέειν ἐπιστάμενοι, τοῖσι αἱ νέες διεφθείροντο, καὶ μὴ ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ ἀπολλύμενοι, ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα διένεον. τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ διεφθάρησαν νέειν οὐκ ἐπιστάμενοι. ἐπεὶ δὲ αἱ πρῶται ἐς φυγὴν ἐτράποντο, ἐνθαῦτα αἱ πλεῖσται διεφθείροντο· οἱ γὰρ ὄπισθε τεταγμένοι, ἐς τὸ πρόσθε τῇσι νηυσὶ παριέναι πειρώμενοι ὡς ἀποδεξόμενοί τι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔργον βασιλέι, τῇσι σφετέρῃσι νηυσὶ φευγούσῃσι περιέπιπτον.

90 Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ τόδε ἐν τῷ θορύβῳ τούτῳ. τῶν τινες

89. 2 ἀριβίγνης C ‖ δὲ ἐὼν? Kallenberg 5 νῆες codd. z ‖ καὶ: οἱ Krueger, van H. 8 ἐπείτε? van H. ‖ ἐσφυγεῖν B 9 ὄπισθεν **B** 10 πρόσθεν **B**: ἔμπροσθε z 11 βασιλεῖ AB ‖ <τῇσι> φευγούσῃσι? Stein[2]

89. 1. **πόνῳ**: cp. 6. 114, 7. 224.

ἀπὸ μὲν . . ἀπὸ δέ: a *tmesis*—well recalling the originally substantive quality of the preposition; cp. 5. 81 (*κατά*).

2. **Ἀριαβίγνης**: cp. 7. 97 *supra*; he was admiral of the Ionio-Karian division. His mother was a daughter of Gobryas, so he was not full brother to the king.

3. **τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων**: *τῶν ἄλλων* is appositive, not adjectival; *Περσέων*, and even *Μήδων*, would hardly come under the head of *συμμάχων*. The Persians and Medes furnished *Epibatai*, cp. 7. 96 *supra*; the Sakai are here not specified, except so far as covered by *συμμάχων*. **Ἑλλήνων** seems to refer primarily to the national forces, but might cover at least some cases on the barbarian side; cp. c. 86 *supra*.

4. **νέειν ἐπιστάμενοι**: an art, not a science; cp. 7. 211, and c. 88 *supra*. The participles refer not to the *ὀλίγοι τινές* who perished, but to the implied majority who survived, even when their ships were destroyed; but Hdt.'s way of putting the case is a little clumsy. **τοῖσι**, relative.

5. **ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ**: cp. 9. 48 *infra*; *cominus*, hand to hand, with the ships laid alongside each other (*συμπλακεισῶν τῶν νεῶν*, cp. c. 84 *supra*) and the *Epibatai* fighting almost as on land. These ones too could have swum, but did not get the chance; nor, again, was it only those who lost their ships that knew how to swim!

6. **ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα διένεον**, 'swam right in to Salamis'—one might have expected some of them to have been picked up on the way. Were there no Greek ships left between them and the shore?

8. **αἱ πρῶται**: the vanguard, the leading ships, the head of the column, the first line, in distinction to **οἱ ὄπισθε τεταγμένοι** the rearward, the second line, the tail of the column, as the case may be; falling back upon those behind, the foremost ships threw everything into confusion (*πόνος, θόρυβος*).

10. **τῇσι νηυσί** is a kind of instrumental, circumstantial, or descriptive dative.

ὡς ἀποδεξόμενοί τι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔργον βασιλέι seems written in view of c. 87 and c. 86—but was there really such keen competition (*καὶ αὐτοί*)?

11. **τῇσι σφετέρῃσι νηυσί**: just the ships on their own side, which were not their own! cp. *σφετέρας* 7. 194. With *περιέπιπτον* cp. *περιπ. περὶ ἀλλήλας* c. 16 *supra*.

90. 1. **τῶν τινες Φοινίκων**: a thoroughly

Φοινίκων, τῶν αἱ νέες διεφθάρατο, ἐλθόντες παρὰ βασιλέα διέβαλλον τοὺς Ἴωνας, ὡς δι' ἐκείνους ἀπολοίατο αἱ νέες, ὡς προδόντων. συνήνεικε ὦν οὕτω ὥστε Ἰώνων τε τοὺς στρατηγοὺς μὴ ἀπολέσθαι Φοινίκων τε τοὺς διαβάλλοντας λαβεῖν τοιόνδε μισθόν. ἔτι τούτων ταῦτα λεγόντων ἐνέβαλε νηὶ Ἀττικῇ Σαμοθρηικίη νηῦς. ἥ τε δὴ Ἀττικὴ κατεδύετο καὶ ἐπιφερομένη Αἰγιναίη νηῦς κατέδυσε τῶν Σαμοθρηίκων τὴν νέα. ἅτε δὲ δὴ ἐόντες ἀκοντισταὶ οἱ Σαμοθρήικες τοὺς ἐπι-

---

90. 2 *Φοινίκων* H. Stephanus: *φοίνικες* || *νῆες* z || *διεφθαρέατο* codd. (*διεφθειρέατο* P) || *βασιλῆα* z 3 *ἀπολλοίατο* C || *νῆες* z || *ὡς προδόντων* del. Cobet, van H. 4 *οὕτω <γενέσθαι> ὥστε*? Stein[2]: nonne melius *οὕτω* secluseris? (cp. van H. in l.) 5 *διαβαλόντας* z 6 *τοιοῦτον* z || *τουτέων* z || *νιῆι* (sic) B 7 *σαμοθραικίη* BC: *σαμοθρακίη* ASV 8 *αἰγινέη* **B**z || *σαμοθρηκῶν* **B** 9 *νῆα* z || *δὲ δὴ* Stein[3]: *δὲ* P marg., Krueger, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *δὴ*

Herodotean collocation, cp. 7. 143, 146 *supra*. The men in question would of course be of high position, kings or what not: it is a pity they are anonymous! Cp. 7. 98.

2. **διεφθάρατο**: a pluperfect, and with its full temporal force.

3. **δι' ἐκείνους**, 'thanks to them.' **ὡς προδόντων** seems to be added as an explanation, not by the Phoenicians, but by the writer; it were as well away, and, but for the change of case, might be bracketed as a gloss. What had the Ionians done? Was it the Ionians who had turned tail? Was it not the Phoenicians who had been leading the van? Were they angry that the Ionians had not made way, when they turned to flight? Or did they suspect the Ionians of collusion with the enemy, and of purposely obstructing the passage? Such questions may seem to treat the anecdote too seriously. It is in any case evidence of a rivalry and friction between Ionian and Phoenician, which was doubtless one of the elements of weakness on the Persian side.

4. **συνήνεικε**: here quite neutral; cp. c. 88 *supra*. **οὕτω**, 'in the following way'—i.q. *ὧδε*.

Ἰώνων . . τοὺς στρατηγούς: not the Persian admirals, but the (subordinate) Greek captains, or generals of squadrons.

6. **μισθόν**: ironical; cp. c. 117 *infra*. Hdt. is not a lover of the Ionians, but he prefers them here to Phoenicians; cp. 7. 23 *supra*.

ἐνέβαλε νηὶ Ἀττικῇ Σαμοθρηικίη νηῦς. The verb is naturally used; cp. c. 87 *supra*. The involution of Attic, Samothrakian, and Aiginetan vessels is remarkable. The Athenian squadron must have taken up more than half the Greek lines of battle; the Aiginetans may have been posted (or had some of their ships posted) on the extreme left of the Peloponnesian contingent, or wing. The Athenian vessel may have come out left of Psyttaleia, and the Aiginetan on the right. The dramatic transaction, which is probably historical, should take place in the outer, not in the inner waters: the notion that it occurred under the very eyes of Xerxes is perhaps for the sake of the moral, i.e. fabulous.

The Samothrakians are in this anecdote regarded as Ionians: the primitive population was Pelasgian, 2. 51; 'Thrakian Samos' (Homer, *Il.* 13. 12) was very naturally believed to have been colonized by 'Samians,' Schol. *ad l.c.*, Pausan. 7. 4. 3; but the story in Pausanias throws some doubt on their Ionism. Blakesley acutely remarks that 'Ionian' was the common orientalism for Hellene, and cps. 4. 138, 6. 8, 7. 95 *supra*.

9. **ἀκοντισταί**: armed with the *ἀκόντιον*, the characteristic weapon of Thrace, of Asia Minor, of the Peltast (cp. Appendix II. § 4), which here proves superior to the panoply of the hoplite. The Samothrakian Peltasts cleared the deck of the heavy infantry, boarded and possessed themselves of the Aiginetan vessel (**ἔσχον**). The amount of ramming

βάτας ἀπὸ τῆς καταδυσάσης νεὸς βάλλοντες ἀπήραξαν καὶ ἐπέβησάν τε καὶ ἔσχον αὐτήν. ταῦτα γενόμενα τοὺς Ἴωνας ἐρρύσατο· ὡς γὰρ εἶδε σφέας Ξέρξης ἔργον μέγα ἐργασαμένους, ἐτράπετο πρὸς τοὺς Φοίνικας οἷα ὑπερλυπεόμενός τε καὶ πάντας αἰτιώμενος, καί σφεων ἐκέλευσε τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀποταμεῖν, ἵνα μὴ αὐτοὶ κακοὶ γενόμενοι τοὺς ἀμείνονας διαβάλλωσι. ὅκως γὰρ τινὰ ἴδοι Ξέρξης τῶν ἑωυτοῦ ἔργον τι ἀποδεικνύμενον ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίῃ, κατήμενος ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρεϊ τῷ ἀντίον Σαλαμῖνος τὸ καλέεται Αἰγάλεως, ἀνεπυνθάνετο τὸν ποιήσαντα, καὶ οἱ

10 νεὼς C: νηὸς z || ἀπήρραξαν z 13 πᾶν z 14 ἐκέλευε Jacobitz 15 διαβάλωσιν R 17 οὐρεϊ CPz, van H.

done is remarkable; and if the description is correct—and as early as 494 B.C. the Ionians at least were supposed to be competent in that manœuvre, cp. 6. 12, 15—the battle of Salamis was not simply a land-fight on 'wooden wall' or 'boarded' field, but a true sea-fight, in which the ship was itself a weapon, and manœuvres were as much the order of the day as simply jamming the ships alongside, and fighting ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ, cp. c. 89.

12. **ὡς γὰρ εἶδε σφέας Ξέρξης**: if this great feat (**ἔργον**) really took place as described; if Xerxes with his own eyes saw it; if he was at that moment sitting somewhere on Mount Aigaleos, or on its skirts (see just below), then the scene of the action would more probably lie west of Psyttaleia. The **σφέας** is rather vaguely referent to τοὺς Ἴωνας. In any case the royal logic was at fault: even if the Samothrakians were Ionians, or passed as such, other Ionians, from Asia and elsewhere, might have deserved all the bad things the Phoenicians were supposed to have said of them. There can be no doubt that **σφεων** refers to Φοίνικας. Xerxes did not order the Phoenicians to cut off the heads of the Ionians, and when he turned himself to the Phoenicians the act was mental rather than physical. 'Heading' was a regular formula, cp. 7. 35 *supra*, and Phoenicians were accustomed to it—in Ionian story. Hdt. below specifies that the king's orders are executed. **ἵνα μὴ . . διαβάλλωσι** seems to be a motive supplied by the narrator, not a part of the king's doom.

17. **κατήμενος ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρεϊ . . Αἰγάλεως.** During at least some part of the day Xerxes may have been seated somewhere on a throne, from which he could witness the fight, "the principal officers of his household standing around him, the imperial parasol held by an attendant over his head, and the scribes by his side, writing down the names of those who had distinguished themselves in the action," Leake, *Athens and the Demi*, ii.[2] 270. From Mount Aigaleos you can overlook the whole bay, and survey the waters both within and beyond the island of *Lipsokutali*: what a view!—but hardly from a seat ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρεϊ, 'at the foot of the mountain.' If the seat of Xerxes was down there, or even down on the lower slopes, but little above the shore, not much would have been seen of the details of a battle, even all confined to the straits and bay of Salamis (*Ambelaki*).

18. The words **τὸ καλέεται Αἰγάλεως** have a parenthetic, not to say gloss-like appearance, but might easily have been inserted by the author himself, after making acquaintance with the scene. To survey all the possible area of action, to look down into the bay of Eleusis as well as into the bay of Salamis, Xerxes would have needed to ascend high on Mt. *Skaramanga*: the matter afloat this time was no mere parade, or procession, as in 4. 88, 7. 44 *supra*. Neither was the king bound to sit still in one spot all the time! He will have ridden to the foot of the ascent, and have moved up and about the high ground, attended by his *aides-de-camp* and suite, as the evolutions of the battle proceeded. Surely, had he been fixed to one spot, we should have heard how he sprang up from his seat, thrice and three times thrice, δείσαντα περὶ τῇ στρατιῇ (7. 212 *supra*). If Xerxes had a throne for this occasion its exact site is hard to define. The ancients themselves are not agreed.

γραμματισταὶ ἀνέγραφον πατρόθεν τὸν τριήραρχον καὶ τὴν

19 τόν τε? Stein[1]

It first makes its appearance in the poetic source: Aischyl. *Pers.* 465 ff. *ἕδραν γὰρ εἶχε παντὸς εὐαγῆ στρατοῦ ὑψηλὸν ὄχθον ἄγχι πελαγίας ἁλός.* In these lines *ἕδραν* is not necessarily even 'a seat,' much less 'his throne' (the *ἀργυρόπους δίφρος* preserved afterwards in the Akropolis and stolen by Glauketes, Demosth. *c. Timocr.* 24. 129, hence the silence of Pausan. 1. 27. 1). *παντὸς στρατοῦ* seems to cover army as well as fleet, and some of the army was, if Hdt. is to be trusted, west of Aigaleos (c. 70 *supra*). *ὑψηλὸν ὄχθον* would at any rate suit Aigaleos, and the top of Aigaleos, but contradicts Hdt.'s *ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρεϊ.* *πελαγίας ἁλός* need not be pressed so as to rule out the straits, as though *πέλαγος* could only mean the high or open seas; but Aischylos is not anyway in strict accord with Hdt. Phanodemos (*ap.* Plutarch. *Themist.* 13) placed the seat of Xerxes *ὑπὲρ τὸ Ἡράκλειον*—which may be the source of Diodoros 11. 18. 2, so far as the king's position is concerned therein—but how far, how much above the Herakleion? The Herakleion apparently occupied the shore end of the ferry, across the narrowest part of the straits (cp. note to c. 97 *infra*). Akestodoros (Plutarch *l.c.*) located the king far to the west, beyond Eleusis, *ἐν μεθορίῳ τῆς Μεγαρίδος ὑπὲρ τῶν καλουμένων Κεράτων.* In that position he would have seen nothing at all of the actual battle described in Hdt., though he might have seen something worth seeing (cp. c. 94 *infra*). The tradition in Akestodoros deserves, however, less absolute contempt than it has received: the very fact that it is so remote from the apparent necessities of the case should have obtained for it a careful scrutiny. Considering that the army, or a part of the army, had moved in the night before the battle to the west (c. 70 *supra*); that on the day before the battle Demaratos and Dikaios, eminent members of the king's suite, were on the Thriasian plain (c. 65 *supra*); that a detachment of the Persian fleet had been sent round Salamis to block the Megarian channel (c. 76 *supra*); that the Greeks were (perhaps) believed to be in full retreat through the bay of Eleusis (c. 75 *supra*), a position overlooking the Megarian Sound might not have seemed ill-chosen for a bird's-eye view of the coming encounters. No one would have suggested it as commanding the actual scene of the battle of Salamis. Given the main facts of the battle, granted the obvious supposition that the king witnessed it, and a place was bound to be provided for him *ἐναντίον τῆς Σαλαμῖνος*, pity that the authorities could not agree whether that place was at the top or the bottom of the mountain! That Xerxes actually ascended the Kerata is incredible. Even if he was at Eleusis on the morning of the battle, he would have hurried eastwards when the true state of the case was revealed by the early light. The greater part of the battle he may have actually overlooked from the heights of *Skaramanga.* The oddity in Aristodem. 1. 2 (*καθεζόμενοι ἐπὶ τοῦ Πάρνηθος ὄρους*) is surely a variant for Aigaleos—the whole for the part. Blakesley's ingenious hypothesis that Xerxes began on the top of the mountain and then descended to the neighbourhood of the Herakleion does not really bear out his own conclusion that "all the varying accounts may have some truth in them," for it ignores Akestodoros; nor does it square with the probable course of events: for at what hour did Xerxes start on the top of the mountain? Did he spend the night there? If not, the unexpected course of events in the morning would probably have upset the plan of ascent. In any case, you inevitably start at the bottom, not at the top of a mountain: once up, no doubt you are sure to come down. The traditional site of the *Throne of Xerxes* is on the hill fronting the road to the ferry, a little beyond the supposed site of the Herakleion. Lolling (Baedeker's *Greece* p. 108) suggested the rocky promontory of *Keratópyrgos*, which projects into the bay about three-quarters of a mile beyond the chapel of St. George, as the point from which Xerxes witnessed the battle, commanding as it does an admirable survey of the straits. It is now occupied by a powder magazine. The partial coincidence between the modern name of this promontory and the Kerata, in Akestodoros, is curious.

οἱ γραμματισταὶ ἀνέγραφον: we have seen these historiographers at

πόλιν. πρὸς δέ τι καὶ προσεβάλετο φίλος ἐὼν <Ἴωσι> Ἀριαράμνης ἀνὴρ Πέρσης παρεὼν τούτου τοῦ Φοινικηίου πάθεος. οἳ μὲν δὴ πρὸς τοὺς Φοίνικας ἐτράποντο.

Τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων ἐς φυγὴν τραπομένων καὶ ἐκπλεόντων 91
πρὸς τὸ Φάληρον, Αἰγινῆται ὑποστάντες ἐν τῷ πορθμῷ ἔργα

---

20 δέ τι Bekker : δ' ἔτι **B** : δὲ ἔτι ceteri || προσεβάλλετο C : προσελάβετο Reiske, van H. || Ἴωσι coni. Stein, approb. van H. : Ἰώνων ante ἐὼν Abresch : cp. comment. infra

---

work, under more favourable circumstances, before, 7. 100 *supra*. Possibly the royal *Anagraphai* may have contained the names of Theomestor and Phylakos, but Hdt. will scarcely have consulted them ; cp. c. 85 *supra*.

19. **πατρόθεν** : cp. 6. 14, but not necessarily a Greek touch ; the patronymic plays a prominent part in the Persian lists, e.g. 7. 61 ff. But **τὸν τριήραρχον καὶ τὴν πόλιν** sounds calculated mainly for the case of Greeks ; what if not a πόλις but an ἔθνος were concerned ? The whole sentence **ὅκως γὰρ . . τὴν πόλιν** comes in very curiously here, and would be better placed at the end of c. 85 after πολλῇ.

20. **πρὸς δέ κτλ.** This is a further explanation of the escape of the Ionians and of the doom (**πάθος**) of the Phoenicians, but the phraseology is peculiar, and the text perhaps corrupt ; cp. App. Crit. The texts vary between **τι** and ἔτι. **προσεβάλετο** is of doubtful sense and reading ; see below.

φίλος ἐών is obscure : whose friend was Ariaramnes ? **Ἴωσι** is conjectural. The last clause, too, **οἳ μὲν δή κτλ.**, appears incomplete. Does the corruption extend perhaps much further than hitherto suspected ? See following note.

προσεβάλετο might be a middle, or a passive, although if Ariaramnes is its subject it is presumably middle, and may be interpreted 'contributed somewhat (τι) to the disaster of the Phoenicians' ; *contulit ad illam Phoenicum cladem* ; Schäfer *ap.* Baehr : Stein compares Eurip. *Med.* 284 συμβάλλεται (*sic*) δὲ πολλὰ τοῦδε δείματος. Baehr himself prefers (with Lange) to take προσεβάλετό τι absolutely, and **παρεών** with τούτου . . πάθεος, '*present* at this disaster' (surely wrong !). (Blakesley reads προσελάβετο and understands Ariaramnes to have shared the fate of the Phoenicians.) **φίλος** has been taken in three ways : τῶν Ἰώνων (Baehr), *amicus regis* (Valla), of the Phoenicians (Blakesley).

I am inclined to suspect that the real verb has here disappeared, and that προσεβάλετο may have come in from lower down, where τοῖσι προσεβάλετο αὐτῇ ἡ ἄχαρις τιμή (7. 36 *supra*), or some similar phrase, seems to have dropped out after **οἳ μὲν δή**. Perhaps the text in this passage ran πρὸς δὲ (ἔτι) καὶ ἐπελάβετο φίλος ἐὼν κτλ., in which case Ariaramnes was a friend of the Phoenicians, and the conjectural Ἴωσι must be omitted. With ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαί τινος cp. 1. 127 (προστάτεω), 6. 49 (προφάσιος), 9. 99 (δυνάμιος), though it must be confessed that πάθεος is not in the same category.

21. **Ἀριαράμνης.** His name suggests that he was an Achaimenid ; cp. 7. 11 *supra*.

91. 1. **τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων** covers, no doubt, Greeks on the Persian side, but would scarcely be used unless Phoenicians and other non-Hellenic folks were included.

ἐκπλεόντων πρὸς τὸ Φάληρον. If the barbarian lines had been all parallel with the Attic shore, then, when driven back and put to flight, the ships would naturally have run aground under Mount Aigaleos. The fact that they make out of the straits for Phaleron, though not perhaps in itself conclusive, favours the view that such was the natural line of retreat. Phaleron, not Peiraieus, is their goal, or base ; cp. cc. 85, 67 *supra*.

2. **Αἰγινῆται ὑποστάντες ἐν τῷ πορθμῷ.** The Aiginetans will have made their way out of the straits to the right of Psyttaleia, unless the squadron here mentioned has come up, during the action, from home (cp. c. 46 *supra*), but the vessels here would surely have been αἱ ἄριστα πλεοῦσαι. **ὑποστάντες** suggests their being posted in ambush, lying in wait, or at least 'waylaying

ἀπεδέξαντο λόγου ἄξια. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐν τῷ θορύβῳ ἐκεράιζον τάς τε ἀντισταμένας καὶ τὰς φευγούσας τῶν νεῶν, οἱ δὲ Αἰγινῆται τὰς ἐκπλεούσας· ὅκως δὲ τινὲς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους
92 διαφύγοιεν, φερόμενοι ἐσέπιπτον ἐς τοὺς Αἰγινήτας. ἐνθαῦτα συνεκύρεον νέες ἥ τε Θεμιστοκλέος διώκουσα νέα καὶ ἡ Πολυκρίτου τοῦ Κριοῦ ἀνδρὸς Αἰγινήτεω νηὶ ἐμβαλοῦσα Σιδωνίῃ, ἥ περ εἷλε τὴν προφυλάσσουσαν ἐπὶ Σκιάθῳ τὴν Αἰγιναίην, ἐπ' ἧς ἔπλεε Πυθέης ὁ Ἰσχενόου, τὸν οἱ Πέρσαι κατακοπέντα ἀρετῆς εἵνεκα εἶχον ἐν τῇ νηὶ ἐκπαγλεόμενοι· τὸν δὴ περιάγουσα ἅμα τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ἥλω <ἡ> νηῦς ἡ Σιδωνίη, ὥστε Πυθέην οὕτω σωθῆναι ἐς Αἴγιναν. ὡς δὲ ἐσεῖδε τὴν νέα τὴν Ἀττικὴν ὁ Πολύκριτος, ἔγνω τὸ σημήιον ἰδὼν τῆς στρατηγίδος, καὶ βώσας τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα ἐπεκερτόμησε ἐς τῶν Αἰγινητέων

---

91. 4 νηῶν *z* **92.** 2 νῆες *z* 3 αἰγινητέων B 5 Ἰσχενόου H. Stephanus: ἰσχένου 6 νιῆι B, cf. c. 90. 6 7 ἡ add. Stein[2] 8 νῆα *z* 9 ἔγνω τε? Stein[2] 10, 12 Θεμιστοκλῆα (bis) *z*

---

the foe,' as they would do if they were covered by Psyttaleia. **ὁ πορθμός** might doubtless refer to the water inside the straits (W. of Psyttaleia) primarily; but it is used, c. 76 *supra*, distinctly of the more open water to the east, and that interpretation seems to give a better sense here.

ἔργα ἀπεδέξαντο λ. ἄξ.: cp. 7. 211. These achievements helped to win them the prize; cp. c. 93 *infra*.

3. **ἐν τῷ θορύβῳ** might almost seem to be locative, in contrast with *ἐν τῷ πορθμῷ*—the Athenians destroying, ramming (**ἐκεράιζον**, c. 86 *supra*) those within in the *mêlée*, whether offering resistance or trying to escape, the Aiginetans waylaying those who were getting out, so that if they escaped (**διαφ.**) the Athenians inside Psyttaleia, they fell headlong (**φ. ἐσέπ.**) among the Aiginetans ambushed outside.

92. 2. **συνεκύρεον**: cp. *συνεκύρησε* c. 87 *supra*. The anecdote which follows is remarkable, *inter alia*, in its bearing on the problem of Hdt.'s composition. 'Polykritos, son of Krios, an Aiginetan,' is introduced, without the slightest apparent reference to the story of the meeting of his father Krios with King Kleomenes, 6. 50 *supra*. Perhaps this is the earlier passage and the earlier anecdote, the enmity of Polykritos and Themistokles having revived, or generated, the story of the medism of Krios 10–11 years earlier; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8. The Sidonian ship must have been originally on the right of the Persian line, or at the head of the Persian column. (By this time the Greek right has probably all pushed out well past Psyttaleia, but the Aiginetans *ὑποστάντες*, c. 91 *supra*.)

4. **ἥ περ εἷλε . . ἐκπαγλεόμενοι**: an implicit reference back to the story told 7. 181 *supra*, with close verbal coincidences, unintelligible except to a reader. **ὥστε . . οὕτω** is one thing, *οὕτω ὥστε* another; cp. c. 90 *supra*.

9. **τὸ σημήιον . . τῆς στρατηγίδος**: i.e. the admiral's flag, or ensign, whatever it was; cp. *τὸ ἐπίσημον τῆς νεός* (of Artemisia) c. 88 *supra*. That the ship was an Attic ship he would have known before identifying it as the Flag-ship. Themistokles was assuredly not the only Athenian Strategos at Salamis; probably all nine others were there (*δέκατος αὐτός* Thuc.), but he was certainly *ἡγεμών*—and doubtless had a thoroughly distinctive and unmistakable pennon or crest. K. O. Müller, *Aeginetica* p. 125, suggests that Polykritos was commander-in-chief of the Aiginetans; if so, he had supported Themistokles' plans, c. 74 *supra*. Or was he perhaps captain of the ship which had run the blockade to invoke the Aiakids?

10. **βώσας . . ὀνειδίζων**, 'after a loud cry (perhaps Themistokles' very name) he reproached Themistokles in bitter

τὸν μηδισμὸν ὀνειδίζων. ταῦτα μέν νυν νηὶ ἐμβαλὼν ὁ Πολύκριτος ἀπέρριψε ἐς Θεμιστοκλέα· οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι τῶν αἱ νέες περιεγένοντο, φεύγοντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς Φάληρον ὑπὸ τὸν πεζὸν στρατόν.

Ἐν δὲ τῇ ναυμαχίῃ ταύτῃ ἤκουσαν Ἑλλήνων ἄριστα 93
Αἰγινῆται, ἐπὶ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀνδρῶν δὲ Πολύκριτός τε ὁ Αἰγινήτης καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι Εὐμένης τε ὁ Ἀναγυράσιος καὶ Ἀμεινίης Παλληνεύς, ὃς καὶ Ἀρτεμισίην ἐπεδίωξε. εἰ μέν νυν

---

11 <*τῇ*> *νηὶ* Reiske, van H. 13 *νῆες* *z* 93. 3 *Ἀθηναῖος* *z* || *ἀναγυρράσιος* **B** 4 <ὁ> Παλληνεύς van H.: *ἀμϊνίης παληνεύς* R || *ἐπεδίωξεν* **B** : *ἀπεδίωξε* *z*

---

terms with reference to the charge of medism against the Aiginetans'—a rather clumsy passage, containing an obscure allusion—nothing having previously been said of any charge of 'medism' against Aigina (except the old charge back in 491 B.C., cp. 6. 49 *supra*: had Themistokles a hand in that?). With **ἐπεκερτόμησε** cp. the adj. *κέρτομος* in 5. 83. One is almost tempted to think that the Attic and Aiginetan ship had collided (*νηὶ ἐμβαλών*). The emendations do not affect this materially. **ἀπέρριψε**: cp. 4. 142, 1. 32, 153.

13. **ἐς Φάληρον ὑπὸ τὸν πεζὸν στρατόν**, 'into Phaleron, under cover of the land-forces'—which cannot, therefore, all have marched westward; cp. c. 70 *supra*. Doubtless the Persian land-forces had lined the whole coast of the straits during the day.

93. 1. **ἤκουσαν Ἑλλήνων ἄριστα Αἰγινῆται**: i.e. the Aiginetans, among states or contingents, obtained the *ἀριστεῖα*: cp. c. 122 *infra*. When was the award made? Immediately after the battle? The Athenians (had) obtained the award for Artemision; cp. c. 17 *supra*. For *εὖ, κακῶς ἀκούειν* cp. 7. 16, 6. 86, 2. 173; and cp. 3. 131. The aid of the Aiakidai may have contributed to the Aiginetan award. It was alleged that the islanders had begun the fight, and with the trireme which had brought that divine aid; cp. c. 84 *supra*. The Athenians perhaps regarded this award as an injustice to themselves; but it was made not for size and weight of vessels, nor for wisdom in the command, nor for the sacrifice of hearth and home, but simply for collective and individual valour in the actual engagement, and we need not assume that it was flagrantly unfair. Hdt.'s account of the battle does perhaps less than justice to the action of the Greek right. The Athenian orator in Thuc. 1. 74 does not precisely challenge this award, and Themistokles had not much to complain of (cc. 123, 124 *infra*).

2. **ἐπί**: as in cc. 67, 113.

ἀνδρῶν δέ: included in *Ἑλλήνων* above, which therefore has no *μέν*.

Πολύκριτος: c. 92 *supra*.

3. **Εὐμένης ὁ Ἀναγυράσιος**: i.e. Eumenes of the deme of *Ἀναγυροῦς* (of the tribe Erechtheis, situate to SE. of Hymettos, and comprising the bay and plain of the modern village *Vari*, named from the *ἀνάγυρος*, *anagyris foetida*, stinking bean-trefoil; cp. L. & S. and Milchhoefer *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa i. 2028). The *Demotikon* shows the official character of the record; but of this Eumenes nothing more appears to be known. Is it possible that Hdt. has, c. 84 *supra*, transferred to Ameinias what belongs to Eumenes? Ameinias has enough to his credit without that! cp. c. 87. There is here a clear reference back to that passage.

4. **εἰ μέν . . οὐκ ἂν . . πρότερον ἢ . . ἧλω**: a very pretty conditional sentence. 'Had he known that Artemisia was aboard, he would not have abandoned the chase until he had captured her or been himself taken prisoner.' **ταύτῃ** is rather loose, as her ship has not been mentioned; *εἰ μέν νυν* **ἔμαθε**, *οὐκ ἂν* **ἐπαύσατο** is of course a perfectly normal form of conditional sentence; **πλέοι** is certainly defensible in the dependent sentence; cp. *εἶεν* c. 107, and App. Crit. The verbs **εἷλε** and **ἧλω** in the indicative appear to be complementary to the construction of the *protasis*. Baehr's notion

ἔμαθε ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ πλέοι Ἀρτεμισίη, οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσατο πρότερον ἢ εἷλέ μιν ἢ καὶ αὐτὸς ἥλω. τοῖσι γὰρ Ἀθηναίων τριηράρχοισι παρεκεκέλευστο, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἄεθλον ἔκειτο μύριαι δραχμαί, ὃς ἄν μιν ζωὴν ἕλῃ· δεινὸν γάρ τι ἐποιεῦντο γυναῖκα ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας στρατεύεσθαι. αὕτη μὲν δή, ὡς πρότερον εἴρηται, διέφυγε· ἦσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι, τῶν αἱ νέες περιεγεγόνεσαν, ἐν τῷ Φαλήρῳ.

94 Ἀδείμαντον δὲ τὸν Κορίνθιον στρατηγὸν λέγουσι Ἀθηναῖοι

5 πλώει ἡ Ἀρτεμισίη z 7 παρακεκέλευστο CPz 8 τοι z 10 εἴρηται 'Plerumque H. addit μοι' van H. || διέφυγε om. C || ἦσαν . . Φαλήρῳ del. Krueger approb. van H. || ἔσαν z || νῆες z 94. 1 Κορινθίων Naber, van H. ('sed fortasse insiticium est στρατηγὸν')

that ἂν has to be mentally supplied is not happy. The double use of ἢ, comparative, and simply alternative, is noticeable.

6. **Ἀθηναίων τριηράρχοισι**: the term *τριήραρχος* is used freely of the ship-captains, or commanders, on both sides, and of any folk; though at Athens a special form of the *τριηραρχία* had perhaps already been instituted; cp. Appendix III. § 4.

7. **παρεκεκέλευστο**: a strict temporal pl.p. from *παρακελεύεσθαι*: cp. c. 15 *supra*, 9. 102 (absolutely).

μύριαι δραχμαί: 100 minai, or 1⅔ talents, say £400, which at the then value of money might be multiplied by at least ten to give the equivalent.

8. **ὃς ἄν μιν ζωὴν ἕλῃ**, (for) 'whoever took her alive.' What did they intend to do with her? It was hardly chivalry that prompted the proclamation: yet was not their guardian deity of the feminine gender? *ζωός* (*sic*) 1. 194, 2. 70, 122, 132, 7. 113.

δεινὸν . . στρατεύεσθαι, 'they took it sorely to heart that a woman should be on the war-trail against Athens'—*δ. ποιέεσθαι* 7. 35 etc. There was the precedent of the Amazons! Cp. 9. 27 *infra*. That war had ended with a wedding.

9. **ὡς πρότερον εἴρηται**: an explicit reference to c. 87 *supra*. *μοι* would make the phrase less like a gloss.

10. **ἦσαν δὲ . . ἐν τῷ Φαλήρῳ.** This sentence is a repetition of the concluding words of c. 92, but with a difference: *ἀπίκοντο* is replaced by *ἦσαν* (action by condition), *τῶν αἱ νέες περιεγένοντο* by *τῶν αἱ ν. περιεγεγόνεσαν* (aorist by pluperfect), and *ἐς Φάληρον* by *ἐν τῷ Φαλήρῳ* (motion by rest). Even **καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι** adds a point. But cp. App. Crit.

94. 1. **Ἀδείμαντον**: c. 5 *supra*, and cp. 7. 137.

λέγουσι Ἀθηναῖοι: the story here told from Athenian sources is a transparent bit of scandal, due to the rivalry and jealousy of Athens and Korinth in and after the Persian war. It is improbable, if not absurd, in itself; it is contradicted by the Korinthians, who were supported by the rest of Greece: Plutarch *de Hdti. malig.* 39 has an easy task in refuting it, by the evidence of extant monuments, and epitaphs and stories. Dio Chrysostom (?) says, *Or.* 37. 7 (ed. Teubner ii. p. 295), that the first draft of Hdt.'s history did not contain the story, and that Hdt. inserted it to revenge himself for the refusal of the Korinthians to give him money. The fact (of composition) and the explanation can here be distinguished. The explanation is itself 'malignant,' and (as Plutarch shows) the anecdote is hardly less to the discredit of the Athenians than of the Korinthians — one might indeed say, more.

The story might well be an addition, an insertion, by the author, in a second or third draft; it has the air of an anecdote, and Hdt. uses below one of the rare formulae (**φάτις ἔχει**) which are most suggestive of oral sources; cp. Introduction, §§ 9, 10. But false as the story must be, had the Athenians no excuse, no peg on which to hang the scandal? If a detachment of the Persian fleet had been sent to circumnavigate Salamis, and to bar or to penetrate the Megarid channel, a squadron of Greek

αὐτίκα κατ᾽ ἀρχάς, ὡς συνέμισγον αἱ νέες, ἐκπλαγέντα τε καὶ ὑπερδείσαντα, τὰ ἱστία ἀειράμενον οἴχεσθαι φεύγοντα, ἰδόντας δὲ τοὺς Κορινθίους τὴν στρατηγίδα φεύγουσαν ὡσαύτως οἴχεσθαι. ὡς δὲ ἄρα φεύγοντας γίνεσθαι τῆς Σαλαμινίης κατὰ ἱρὸν Ἀθηναίης Σκιράδος, περιπίπτειν σφι κέλητα θείῃ πομπῇ,

---

2 καταρχὰς AB || νῆες z 3 τὰ del. Krueger 4 φέρουσαν C
6 τὸ ἱρὸν z, van H. || σκιρράδος B

---

ships must have been detached to confront the 'barbarians' and keep them out. The 40 Korinthian ships may have been detached on this service (cp. the service of the 53 Athenian ships at Chalkis, c. 14 *supra*), and may even have had some fighting to do on their own account. The Athenian travesty need not be brought down to the date of the Archidamian war in 431 B.C.; the first Peloponnesian war in 458 B.C. would be a possible occasion; but there was already friction enough in 480 B.C. for a deal of mutual scandal to be set afloat.

2. **αὐτίκα κατ᾽ ἀρχάς**: cp. 7. 88 *supra*.

συνέμισγον: here of hostile encounter, cp. 1. 166, 4. 127, 6. 14; of friendly converse, cc. 67, 79 *supra*, etc.

3. **τὰ ἱστία ἀειράμενον**: cp. c. 56 *supra*.

4. **τοὺς Κορινθίους**: all forty vessels! c. 43 *supra*; what of the Amprakiotes, and Leukadians (making together ten more, c. 45 *supra*)? The Athenians forgot to account for them; but probably they accompanied the Korinthians for better or worse.

5. **ἄρα**: still the Athenian reporter; the word has a touch of malignity here, even if it betokens 'an advance in the action' (Abicht) as in 7. 116, 9. 8.

κατὰ ἱρὸν Ἀθηναίης Σκιράδος. According to Pausan. 1. 36. 4 the oldest temple of Athene Skiras was at Phaleron, and had been founded by a diviner from Dodona named Σκῖρος, who had fallen in the war between the Eleusinians and Erechtheus, and had been buried, by them, near a torrent, which afterwards, as well as the place, was known by his name. The temple here in question cannot be the one at Phaleron; it is plainly on Salamis. Strabo 393 gives Σκιράς as an old name of Salamis, 'from some hero,' and therefrom derives also the title of Athene. The Σκιρωνὶς ὁδός is not far off, cp. c. 70 *supra*. σκῖρος means hard, harsh (σκλῆρος), and appears in the names of rough places, cp. Σκιρῖτις. The connexion with σκίρον, Σκιροφόρια (cp. Strabo *l.c.*) is doubtless based upon a *Volksetymologie*. The temple on Salamis may have had no proper connexion with the temple at Phaleron. As to its position: (i.) Stein places the temple of Athene Skiras on the extreme southern point of the island; the ἄκρον τὸ Σκιράδιον is mentioned by Plutarch, *Solon* 9, as apparently in the neighbourhood of a χηλή τις πρὸς τὴν Εὔβοιαν (*sic*) ἀποβλέπουσα, and in *Mor.* 870 (=*de Hdti. m.* 39) this episode is located περὶ τὰ λήγοντα τῆς Σαλαμινίας—which would perhaps suit that 'end' of Salamis best. If this view be correct the line of the Korinthian flight would lie outside the island, and be quite inconsistent with any of the theories of the battle-lines. (ii.) Leake, *Topogr. and Demi*, ii.[2] 171 ff., identified the spot with "the north-western promontory of Salamis" now occupied by a monastery of the Παναγία φανερωμένη (the Virgin brought to light). The monastery stands on the site of an Hellenic building. This position would suit the argument better; and the continued existence of a sacred building is in its favour. (iii.) Westermann *ad* Plutarch. makes it the extreme western promontory of Salamis, nearest Megara. This location suits best with the suggestion above made in regard to the true services of the Korinthians; moreover, if one were concerned to rationalize the incident of the κέλης this position would be the most intelligible: a message, carried from the Greek fleet, across the wasp's waist of Salamis, and then by boat to Budoron, might easily have 'met' the Korinthians as they made their way out of the straits.

6. **περιπίπτειν**, 'encountered,' c. 89 *supra*.

κέλητα: here inevitably a boat, cp. 7. 86 *supra*; **θείῃ πομπῇ** 4. 152 etc.

τὸν οὔτε πέμψαντα φανῆναι οὐδένα, οὔτε τι τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς στρατιῆς δὴ εἰδόσι προσφέρεσθαι τοῖσι Κορινθίοισι· τῇ δὴ συμβάλλονται εἶναι θεῖον τὸ πρῆγμα. ὡς γὰρ ἀγχοῦ γενέσθαι τῶν νεῶν, τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κέλητος λέγειν τάδε. "Ἀδείμαντε, σὺ μὲν ἀποστρέψας τὰς νέας ἐς φυγὴν ὅρμησαι καταπροδοὺς τοὺς Ἕλληνας· οἳ δὲ καὶ δὴ νικῶσι ὅσον αὐτοὶ ἠρῶντο ἐπικρατήσαντες τῶν ἐχθρῶν." ταῦτα λεγόντων ἀπιστέειν γὰρ τὸν Ἀδείμαντον, αὖτις τάδε λέγειν, ὡς αὐτοὶ οἷοί τε εἶεν ἀγόμενοι ὅμηροι ἀποθνήσκειν, ἢν μὴ νικῶντες φαίνωνται οἱ Ἕλληνες. / οὕτω δὴ ἀποστρέψαντα τὴν νέα αὐτόν τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπ' ἐξεργασμένοισι ἐλθεῖν ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον. τούτους μὲν τοιαύτη φάτις ἔχει ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων, οὐ μέντοι αὐτοί γε Κορίνθιοι ὁμολογέουσι, ἀλλ' ἐν πρώτοισι σφέας αὐτοὺς τῆς ναυμαχίης νομίζουσι γενέσθαι· μαρτυρέει δέ σφι καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Ἑλλάς.

95 Ἀριστείδης δὲ ὁ Λυσιμάχου ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος, τοῦ καὶ

7 φάναι C 8 τῇ δὴ Stein[(2)3] (et Madvig), Holder, van H. : τῇδε δὲ 10 νηῶν z || λέγει C 11 ναῦς || φυγεῖν B || ὥρμησαι 𝔖, Stein[1] 12 αὐτοὶ : αὖ 𝔖 13 ἐπικρατήσαντες Stein[2], van H. : ἐπικρατῆσαι 14 καὶ ὡς? Stein[2] || τε del. Cobet, van H. : 'expectabam ἑτοῖμοι vel ἄρτιοι' van H. 16 ἀποστρέψαντες z || νῆα z 17 ἐπεξειργασμένοισι Cz 20 μαρτυρεῖ codd. z, Holder, van H.

7. **τὸν οὔτε . . οὐδένα.** 'It was never discovered that any one had despatched the boat,' rather than 'it was evident that no one had despatched the boat'—a *ὕστερον* would make the point clearer. But there was apparently nothing at the moment in evidence to suggest to the Korinthians the supernatural character of the occurrence.

οὔτε τι . . Κορινθίοισι: the meaning is clear, but the expression is involved: 'and the Korinthians whom it approached knew nothing of the fortunes of the fleet'; i.e. *προσφέρεσθαί τε τ. Κ. οὐδὲν τῶν ἀπὸ τ. στ. εἰδόσι.* The participle is essentially a part of the predicate. **τὰ ἀπό,** as of news from; cp. 4. 54 *τὰ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ποταμῶν.*

9. **συμβάλλονται**: *coniiciunt*; sc. *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, οἱ λέγοντες.*

10. **τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κέλητος**: a false parallel to *τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς στρατιῆς* just above; perhaps an 'unconscious iteration.'

11. **ἀποστρέψας** apparently means 'having turned tail,' or having turned aside, cp. c. 87 *supra*; which shows that *τὰς νέας* is here superfluous; cp. 4. 43. The word is repeated below, of the return from flight.

ἐς φυγὴν ὅρμησαι: the verb is apparently perf. pass. unaugmented; cp. App. Crit. **καὶ δὴ**=*ἤδη* 4. 102. **καταπροδοὺς**: cp. 7. 157, 9. 7, 11 etc.

12. **ὅσον αὐτοὶ ἠρῶντο,** 'to the height of their own prayers,' i.e. of the Greeks.

14. **ὡς αὐτοὶ . . ἀποθνήσκειν**: i.e. the men in the boat (their number is not given) offered to be treated as hostages, to go bail, for the truth of their statement. Yet Adeimantos lets them depart, apparently convinced by this generous offer! **ἀγόμενοι,** middle, 'of their own accord.'

17. **ἐπ' ἐξεργασμένοισι ἐλθεῖν**: cp. 9. 77 *infra*.

τὸ στρατόπεδον, the fleet; cp. c. 11 l. 7, c. 84 l. 11 *supra*.

18. **φάτις ἔχει**: cp. 7. 3 *supra*, and Introduction, § 10.

95. 1. **Ἀριστείδης . . Ἀθηναῖος**: cp. c. 79 *supra*. To have the full description

ὀλίγῳ τι πρότερον τούτων ἐπεμνήσθην ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἀρίστου, οὗτος ἐν τῷ θορύβῳ τούτῳ τῷ περὶ Σαλαμῖνα γενομένῳ τάδε ἐποίεε· παραλαβὼν πολλοὺς τῶν ὁπλιτέων οἳ παρατετάχατο παρὰ τὴν ἀκτὴν τῆς Σαλαμινίης χώρης, γένος ἐόντες Ἀθηναῖοι,

95. 2 ἐμνήσθην Pz 4 οἳ: οἱ R: οἳ πολλοὶ z

of the man repeated *totidem verbis* within a few pages, together with the express and unusually explicit reference back (**τοῦ . . ἀρίστου**), creates a problem in regard to Hdt.'s composition. It can hardly be that the two passages belong to one and the same draft of the Book, and were written *in einem Flug*. This passage may belong to the first draft, that to the second; in which case the back reference was inserted, apologetically, without sacrificing the 'patronymic' and 'ethnic,' which serve to emphasize the deed of Aristeides. Was Aristeides in command of all the Athenian hoplites on shore (amounting to some thousands), while Themistokles was in command of the fleet?

3. **τάδε ἐποίεε.** There are three accounts of the exploit, more or less differing from each other, but substantially reconcilable: (i.) Aischylos (*Persae* 447 ff.) places the affair late in the day apparently, when the enemy's fleet has been beaten, and there is nothing to prevent the Greeks surrounding the island with their own ships (Blakesley). It is not, however, correct to say that Aischylos represents the assault as made by the actual crews of the vessels (Rawlinson); and it is only fair to observe that in Aischylos Xerxes is still looking on. (ii.) Herodotus places the exploit late in his narrative (perhaps in conformity with Aischylos), but apparently dates the affair earlier on the day of battle (ἐν τῷ θορύβῳ τούτῳ κτλ.: cp. c. 91 *supra*). He does not explain how Aristeides got his men on to the island: boats may be supposed. A happy thought apparently occurs to Aristeides while the battle is raging, and he executes it *instanter*. (iii.) Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 9, of course, goes further. Aristeides observes that the island is strongly occupied: puts picked volunteers in boats, destroys all the Persians, except a few (whom he sends to Themistokles, three nephews of the king included, who were immolated ὠμηστῇ Διονύσῳ), and occupies the whole shore of the island with troops in order to assist the men of the fleet in destroying the enemy. Yet Plutarch may be substantially right.

The occupation of Psyttaleia by the Persians on this occasion proved as great a tactical blunder as the occupation of Sphakteria by the Spartans in 425 B.C., and for the same reason, that the occupants of the island were involved in the fate of the fleet. But there was more excuse for the Persian. The naval superiority of the Greeks was not a foregone conclusion, and the occupation of Psyttaleia probably had as its ultimate object a landing on Salamis, and an assault upon the Greek forces in the island. This aspect of the case makes it not improbable that the Athenian attack on the island should be placed ἐν τῷ θορύβῳ τούτῳ with Hdt., with Plutarch, and even possibly with Aischylos: it was not a mere afterthought, or sequel of the battle, but an essential part of it, concerted, in all probability, between Themistokles and Aristeides. The Athenian hoplites remembered Marathon: not a few of them had even fought there.

4. **τῶν ὁπλιτέων οἳ παρατετάχατο**: he did not denude Salamis of its defenders. The παράταξις shows that the generals perfectly understood the situation: just at that point, where the Greek right wing was posted, a success, even temporary, on the part of the Persians, would have led to an attempt to land from Psyttaleia upon Salamis (Kynosura), from which it would have been difficult to dislodge the enemy.

5. **τὴν ἀκτὴν τῆς Σαλαμινίης χώρης** may refer primarily to Keos = Kynosura, but need scarcely be confined to that promontory. If Aristeides was in command (στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα) he would naturally have been on the right in this immediate neighbourhood.

γένος ἐόντες Ἀθηναῖοι: this particularity is remarkable: were his volunteers primarily the Salaminian οἰκήτορες?

ἐς τὴν Ψυττάλειαν νῆσον ἀπέβησε ἄγων· οἳ τοὺς Πέρσας τοὺς ἐν τῇ νησῖδι ταύτῃ κατεφόνευσαν πάντας.

96 *Ὡς δὲ ἡ ναυμαχίη διελέλυτο, κατειρύσαντες ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα οἱ Ἕλληνες τῶν ναυηγίων ὅσα ταύτῃ ἐτύγχανε ἔτι ἐόντα, ἕτοιμοι ἦσαν ἐς ἄλλην ναυμαχίην, ἐλπίζοντες τῇσι περιεούσῃσι νηυσὶ ἔτι χρήσεσθαι βασιλέα. τῶν δὲ ναυηγίων πολλὰ ὑπολαβὼν ἄνεμος ζέφυρος ἔφερε τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐπὶ τὴν ἠιόνα τὴν καλεομένην Κωλιάδα· ὥστε ἀποπλησθῆναι τὸν χρησμὸν τόν τε ἄλλον πάντα τὸν περὶ τῆς ναυμαχίης ταύτης*

---

6 *νῆσον* del. Cobet, Holder, van H. 7 *νησίδι* CPz 96. 1 *κατερύσαντες* CP: *κατερρύσαντες* z 2 *ταύτηι* **a**: *ταύτῃ ἔτι* **B** 3 *ἑτοῖμοι* CPz || *ἔσαν* z 4 *βασιλῆα* z 5 *ὑποβαλὼν* C || *ὁ ἄνεμος* z || *ἐξέφερε τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς* Lex. Vindob. p. 181 6 *ἀποπλησθῆναι* Valla (*ut impletum sit*): *ἀποπλῆσθαι* Buttmann: *ἀποπεπλῆσθαι* Abicht, van H.: *ἀποπλῆσαι*

---

6. **Ψυττάλειαν**: c. 76 *supra*. According to Steph. Byz. the island was named from *Ψύτταλος*: but what of him?

ἀπέβησε ἄγων: he headed the landing-party. *ἀπέβ.* is trans. The last sentence of the chapter denies the sacrifice, the story of which is preserved by Plutarch; see above.

96. 1. **διελέλυτο**: pl.p. There is no more actual fighting going on. Aischylos, *Pers.* 428, does not say that the actual fighting, but that the weeping and wailing lasted *ἕως κελαινῆς νυκτὸς ὄμμ' ἀφείλετο*. Hdt. plainly implies that the battle was over, in time apparently for the Greeks to apprehend a fresh attack.

κατειρύσαντες, to land. In the *Odyssey* it is always used of dragging the vessel down into the sea.

2. **ὅσα ταύτῃ . . ἔτι ἐόντα**: i.e. not yet driven by wind or current to the Attic coast; see just below. They would easily possess themselves of the wrecks west of Psyttaleia. Evidently at first they did not realize the magnitude of their success, or the depression of the enemy, but expected (**ἐλπίζοντες**) that the king would order a fresh attack.

3. **τῇσι περιεούσῃσι νηυσί**: not merely, or so much, those which had returned to Phaleron (c. 92 *supra*), as the squadron which had moved round the island the night before, and were still perhaps almost intact, c. 76 *supra*. The text may originally have proceeded *Ξέρξης δέ κτλ.* c. 97 *infra*; the intervening passage has the air of a *παρενθήκη* (cp. 7. 171), or *προσθήκη* (4. 30), added in his second draft by Hdt. after a visit to Athens; cp. Introduction, § 9.

5. **ὑπολαβών**: as in 7. 170 *supra*.

τὴν ἠιόνα τὴν καλεομένην Κωλιάδα: Kolias is a cape, or promontory (*ἄκρα ἤτοι ἀκτή*, Steph. Byz.), some twenty stades from Phaleron, cp. Pausan. 1. 1. 5 *ἀπέχει δὲ σταδίους εἴκοσιν ἄκρα Κωλιάς· . . Κωλιάδος δέ ἐστιν ἐνταῦθα Ἀφροδίτης ἄγαλμα καὶ Γενετυλλίδες ὀνομαζόμεναι θεαί.* Leake's identification of Kolias with *Hagios Georgios* (*τρεῖς Πύργοι*), the eastern limit of the bay of Phaleron, is endorsed by Milchhoefer: Strabo 398 places it apparently further south, in the neighbourhood of Anaphlystos. Cp. Hitzig-Bluemner, Pausanias, *l.c.*

ἠιών, as in 7. 44 *supra*.

6. **ὥστε . . τὸ εἰρημένον**: the structure and argument of the passage are remarkable: what Hdt. is apparently concerned to say is that *τὸν χρησμὸν ἀποπλησθῆναι ὃς ἐλελήθεε πάντας τοὺς Ἕλλήνας*, sc. *τὸ πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον τούτων ἐν χρησμῷ Λυσιστράτῳ Ἀθηναίῳ ἀνδρὶ χρησμολόγῳ εἰρημένον*—but, having started on the fulfilment of prophecy, he is led to say a good word in passing for the much more extensive and less obscure prophecy of Bakis. When he started, **τὸν χρησμόν** may have been intended for the prophecy of Lysistratos, but as it is diverted to Bakis, the idea is resumed in the words *τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν χρησμῷ*.

7. **τόν τε ἄλλον πάντα . . Βάκιδι.** On Bakis cp. c. 77 *supra*. There was presumably extant in Hdt.'s time a pretty

εἰρημένον Βάκιδι [*καὶ* Μουσαίῳ], *καὶ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τὰ ναυήγια τὰ ταύτῃ ἐξενειχθέντα τὸ εἰρημένον πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον τούτων ἐν χρησμῷ* Λυσιστράτῳ Ἀθηναίῳ *ἀνδρὶ χρησμολόγῳ, τὸ ἐλελήθεε πάντας τοὺς* Ἕλληνας,

Κωλιάδες *δὲ γυναῖκες ἐρετμοῖσι φρύξουσι.*

τοῦτο δὲ ἔμελλε ἀπελάσαντος βασιλέος ἔσεσθαι.

97 Ξέρξης *δὲ ὡς ἔμαθε τὸ γεγονὸς πάθος, δείσας μή τις τῶν*

---

8 *καὶ* Μουσέῳ *z*: 'fortasse spuria' Stein, seclusi: verba *τὸν χρησμὸν . . ἐξενειχθέντα* genuina esse dubit. van H. 9 *ἐξενεχθέντα* CR 10 *τουτέων z* 11 *λέληθε*? Stein[2] 12 *φρύξουσι* Joach. Kuhn: *φρίξουσι* 13 *ἐπελάσαντος βασιλῆος z* **97.** 1 *τῶν τις* Krueger, van H.

---

extensive oracular poem ascribed to Bakis, the reference of which to Salamis was obvious. Cp. Introduction, § 10. **καὶ Μουσαίῳ** is to be removed as a gloss: otherwise the problem of the authorship of the poem is hopelessly confused. On Musaios cp. 9. 43.

9. **πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον τούτων: τούτων** referring not to Hdt. and his own date of composition, still less to Bakis and Musaios, or the oracles of Bakis, but to the battle of Salamis, and the circumstances by which the prediction was fulfilled. The date is unfortunately vague: does it refer to the times of Peisistratos, or of Solon, or to still more ancient days?

10. **Λυσιστράτῳ** cannot of course be the Athenian, more or less contemporary with Hdt., who is a frequent subject of satire to Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 855, *Knts.* 1267, *Wsps.* 787 ff., 1301, *Lysistr.* 1105), but might conceivably be an ancestor of his.

11. **τὸ ἐλελήθεε πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας.** Stein[5] has cancelled his own emendation *λέληθε*, and is content to return to the view that Hdt. is not claiming for himself the first correct application of the prophecy of Lysistratos, but dates the true interpretation to the time of Salamis. But the antiquity of the oracle demands an earlier occasion; one might be found in the great adventure of Solon at Kolias, narrated in Plutarch, *Solon*, 8, which, according to one account, led to the Athenian capture of Salamis, though it is easy to understand that the learned Hellenes, interpreters of prophecy, in discussing such matters, might gladly have transferred, before the date of Hdt.'s composition, the fulfilment of this *chresm* to the still grander occasion in their own times. Solon's adventure was scarcely remembered outside Athens—and Megara! 'The Hellenes' here may well be writers, even if Hdt. himself is not claiming to have put them right. Cp. Introduction, § 10.

12. **Κωλιάδες δὲ γυναῖκες ἐρετμοῖσι φρύξουσι.** 'The women of Kolias' are probably not so much local residents as women visiting the place for the cult or festival of the local Demeter (*sic*, Plutarch, *Solon*, 8), who may have used the oars (of the Megarians?) to cook their cakes with. *φρύξουσι*, though an emendation, seems acceptable, and more oracular than *φρίξουσι* (cp. *φρύξαντες* 2. 94). *πέλανοι* would be used in the local cult; or perhaps *κριθαὶ πεφρυγμέναι*, Thuc. 6. 22. Applied to the b. of Salamis in 480 B.C., the prophecy would have been fulfilled 'after the king's departure,' an event far in the future (*ἔμελλε ἔσεσθαι*), in the time of Lysistratos!

97. 1. **ὡς ἔμαθε τὸ γεγονὸς πάθος,** 'when he became aware of the extent of the disaster which had taken place.' **τις τῶν**: contr. c. 90 *supra*.

δείσας μὴ . . ἀπολέσθαι: this reported apprehension of Xerxes conveys potentially a criticism upon the Greek conduct of affairs at this crisis. The Greeks failed to utilize their victory to the full. Had the Persian communications with Asia been cut at this date, the king might never have returned alive, a revolt in Asia would certainly have taken place, Thrace and Macedon might have used their opportunity, the battle of Plataia need never have been fought. It was not the fault of Themistokles that the more daring but, in the

Ἰώνων ὑποθῆται τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἢ αὐτοὶ νοήσωσι πλέειν ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον λύσοντες τὰς γεφύρας, καὶ ἀπολαμφθεὶς ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ κινδυνεύσῃ ἀπολέσθαι, δρησμὸν ἐβούλευε. θέλω δὲ μὴ ἐπίδηλος εἶναι μήτε τοῖσι Ἕλλησι μήτε τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ, ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα χῶμα ἐπειρᾶτο διαχοῦν, γαύλους τε Φοινικηίους

2 ἐπινοήσωσι? Stein[2], van H. 4 ἀπολέσθαι κινδυνεύσηι Ccorr. P: ἀπολέσθαι κινδυνεύσει Cpr.: ἀπολέσθαι κινδυνεῦσαι z || ἐβούλευσε Pz 5 ἐπίδημος **B** 6 γαυλοὺς libri, van H.

long run, the more prudent course was omitted; cp. c. 108 *infra*.

3. **ἀπολαμφθείς**: c. 11 *supra*.

4. **δρησμόν**: c. 4 *supra*.

5. **ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα χῶμα ἐπειρᾶτο διαχοῦν**, 'he attempted (more than 'began') to construct a mole right across to Salamis,' from the mainland. Hdt. unfortunately does not locate the structure. The time, the place, the nature of the work, and its purpose, are all in debate. The likeliest place would be on the line of the existing ferry, both because that is the shortest line, and also because the island of *St. George* offers a ready-made pier or *point d'appui* for the structure, though not on the direct line, which would be less than a mile across. Ktesias, *Persica*, ed. Gilmore, § 57, p. 157, locates the mole, and dates the attempt before the battle: *ὁ δὲ Ξέρξης αὐτόθεν ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ στεινότατον τῆς Ἀττικῆς (Ἡράκλειον καλεῖται) ἐχώννυε χῶμα ἐπὶ Σαλαμῖνα πεζῇ ἐπ' αὐτὴν διαβῆναι διανοούμενος.* The attempt is frustrated by Themistokles and Aristeides, who procure archers from Krete; and its failure makes a sea-fight necessary. The place may be right, 'the narrowest part of Attica' being taken to mean the narrowest part of the straits between Attica and Salamis; the time, or sequence, appears to be better in Hdt. To construct a mole, or bridge of boats, all across the straits, while the Greeks were in possession, and without a naval battle, was impossible. Moreover, before the naval battle such a work would have been inconsistent with the naval tactics. If it had run (as Stein supposes) from the Herakleion to Kynosura, it would (if completed) have kept the king's fleet out of the straits, and the Greek fleet inside! But even running from the extreme point of *Skaramanga* to the isle of St. George, or (and) on to the actual shore of Salamis, it could not have been seriously undertaken before a naval victory had cleared the Greek ships out of the bay; and it would have interfered with any design of circumnavigating the island freely. Alexander, indeed, attempted to take Tyre with a mole, while the Tyrians had command of the sea, Arrian 2. 18. But the two cases are not parallel. Tyre was a fortified island of small dimensions, half a mile only off the coast, and not in any way embayed; moreover, Alexander failed, until he had secured command of the sea, to capture the place. (Rawlinson is wrong on this matter of fact.) Thus a serious attempt to bridge the channel to Salamis was absurd and impossible without an antecedent naval victory; after a naval defeat, still more so. It follows that, if any such attempt at all was made, it was a feint, or it was some work completely misunderstood by Hdt.'s sources and himself. Phoenician round-ships may have been lashed together, the beginning of a mole or pier may have been started, and this work may have been begun before the naval engagement, in confident anticipation of a victory. After the naval defeat such preparations could have deceived nobody, and must have been abandoned. In regard to the form of the structure itself, the *χῶμα* may have been intended to serve as a solid pier leading on to the round-ships, which would support some sort of roadway, and could be tugged into position after the Greek fleet had been disabled. It is noticeable that, even according to Hdt., preparations for another naval battle are also on foot; i.e. command of the sea must be regained before the connexion with Salamis could be established, over which the land-forces might pour into the island. Is it not also possible that the projected or attempted structure was rather of the nature of a wharf or jetty or pier, for embarkation and so on, and

συνέδεε, ἵνα ἀντί τε σχεδίης ἔωσι καὶ τείχεος, ἀρτέετό τε ἐς πόλεμον ὡς ναυμαχίην ἄλλην ποιησόμενος. ὁρῶντες δέ μιν πάντες οἱ ἄλλοι ταῦτα πρήσσοντα εὖ ἠπιστέατο ὡς ἐκ παντὸς νόου παρεσκεύασται μένων πολεμήσειν· Μαρδόνιον δ' οὐδὲν τούτων ἐλάνθανε ὡς μάλιστα ἔμπειρον ἐόντα τῆς ἐκείνου διανοίης.

98 *Ταῦτά τε ἅμα Ξέρξης ἐποίεε καὶ ἔπεμπε ἐς Πέρσας ἀγγελέοντα τὴν παρεοῦσάν σφι συμφορήν. τούτων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐστὶ οὐδὲν ὅ τι θᾶσσον παραγίνεται θνητὸν ἐόν· οὕτω τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ἐξεύρηται τοῦτο. λέγουσι γὰρ ὡς ὁσέων*

---

8 ὁρέωντες C: ὁρέοντες Pz, Stein[1], van H. 9 εὖ del. Krueger 10 παρεσκεύαστο z 11 τουτέων z || ἐόντα om. R **98.** 1 τε om. S 2 παρεοῦσάν Pz: παροῦσαν || τουτέων z 3 ἔστι PRz 4 ὁσέων Stein, van H.: ὅσον A: ὅσων

---

was never intended to reach the opposite shore?

9. **εὖ ἠπιστέατο**: i.e. merely 'were fully convinced,' 'firmly believed'; cp. c. 88 *supra*.

ἐκ παντὸς νόου παρεσκεύασται, (that the king) 'has completely made up his mind'; the verb, though passive in form, has obviously a middle force.

10. **Μαρδόνιον**: cp. c. 68 *supra*.

11. **ἐλάνθανε**: not merely 'escaped,' but 'deceived'; Mardonios saw through the king's ruse. He had most knowledge of the king's mental ways! **διανοίης**: cp. c. 88 *supra*.

98. 1. **ἔπεμπε**: was the postal route really carried all round the Aegean, from Athens to the Hellespont, and so on to Susa? Was there no system of signalling? Cp. 9. 3 *infra*. The *parataxis* with **τε ἅμα καί** may be noticed; the need for special emphasis is not obvious.

2. **σφι** would seem to refer primarily to (ἐς) Πέρσας, where the συμφορή was not, strictly speaking, παρεοῦσα—at least until the news arrived. It may be taken to cover all Persians—those at home being involved unwittingly in the disaster to those abroad. The word can hardly be taken simply with ἀγγελέοντα—and ἐς Πέρσας is practically rather locative than ethnical.

3. **ἐστὶ οὐδὲν ὅ τι θᾶσσον παραγίνεται θνητὸν ἐόν**, 'there is nothing which comes along so fast—and yet is mortal.' This saying has almost a touch of *autopsis*, and is more forcible than the stereotyped τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. (But cp. 2. 68 for the two in combination.) There are two points in which this account of the Persian postal service has a special interest for the problem of Hdt.'s composition: (i.) This passage conflicts with 3. 105 *εἶναι δὲ ταχυτῆτα οὐδενὶ ἑτέρῳ ὅμοιον, οὕτω ὥστε, εἰ μὴ προλαμβάνειν τοὺς Ἰνδοὺς τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐν ᾧ τοὺς μύρμηκας συλλέγεσθαι, οὐδένα ἂν σφέων ἀποσώζεσθαι.* Hdt. must have forgotten the one passage in writing the other. (ii.) A more important point: the Persian postal service is taken for granted in 3. 126 without description, and the very term itself—**ἀγγαρήιον** here explained—is used. (The substitution of ἀγγελιηφόρον is the substitution of the gloss for the text.) This passage, therefore, would appear to be of earlier composition than Bk. 3, although one must admit that the description of the post has not been introduced at the first possible occasion even in these Books (e.g. c. 54 *supra*). In 1. 216 the horse is described as πάντων τῶν θνητῶν τὸ τάχιστον—a statement not inconsistent with this passage, but in a different *genre*.

4. **οὕτω . . ἐξεύρηται τοῦτο**, 'this swiftness the Persians have secured by the invention of those special messengers'; or, perhaps, 'this institution of messengers is a Persian invention for securing extraordinary rapidity.' Stein renders *οὕτω adeo sollerter*, comparing 4. 200 *τοῦτο μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἐξευρέθη*. But there the οὕτω may be merely modal, referring to the method of discovery just previously described. Others, again, boldly refer the whole sentence to what follows; so Rawlinson, "and this is the method of

ἂν ἡμερέων <*ᾖ*> *ἡ πᾶσα ὁδός, τοσοῦτοι ἵπποι τε καὶ ἄνδρες διεστᾶσι, κατὰ ἡμερησίην ὁδὸν ἑκάστην ἵππος τε καὶ ἀνὴρ τεταγμένος· τοὺς οὔτε νιφετός, οὐκ ὄμβρος, οὐ καῦμα, οὐ νὺξ ἔργει μὴ οὐ κατανύσαι τὸν προκείμενον αὐτῷ δρόμον τὴν ταχίστην. ὁ μὲν δὴ πρῶτος δραμὼν παραδιδοῖ τὰ ἐντεταλμένα τῷ δευτέρῳ, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος τῷ τρίτῳ· τὸ δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν ἤδη κατ' ἄλλον* <*καὶ ἄλλον*> *διεξέρχεται παραδιδόμενα, κατά περ* <*ἐν*> *Ἕλλησι ἡ λαμπαδηφορίη τὴν τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ ἐπιτελέουσι. τοῦτο τὸ δράμημα τῶν ἵππων καλέουσι Πέρσαι ἀγγαρήιον.*

---

5 *ᾖ* add. Schaefer, Stein, Holder, van H. 6 *ἵπποι* **B**: *ἵππος τε καὶ ἀνὴρ* om. *z* 7 *τεταγμένοι z* || *οὔτε*: *οὔ τι z*, Schaefer: *οὐ* Cobet 8 *ἐέργει z* || *ἑωυτῷ z*, van H.: 'An delendum?' idem 11 *καὶ ἄλλον* Valla (*alium atque alium*) 12 *ἐν* add. Stein[2] (*παρὰ*? Stein[1]) || *λαμπαδιφορίη* **B** 13 *ἀγγειρήϊον* R: num verba *τοῦτο . . ἀγγαρήιον* quasi glossema sustuleris?

---

it" (which will hardly do). It is unlikely, by the way, that 'the Persians' invented this courier service, or imperial post, though Xenophon, *Kyrop.* 8. 6. 17 f., ascribes it to Kyros, and Baehr—on general grounds—to Dareios. The invention may be taken to be centuries older than either, and to have been employed by all the great empires and kingdoms which were now merged in the Persian. It is substantially one with the system of the Prairie Post, or *Pony Express*, described by Mark Twain in *Roughing it*, c. viii.

λέγουσι: with this admission we relapse upon hearsay, or it may be a previous writer's description (Hekataios?). **ἡ πᾶσα ὁδός**, if it referred primarily to any actual route, would probably be the Royal Road, described in 5. 52 f., along which no doubt the Anatolian posts travelled. But the word is here of purely generic significance.

6. **διεστᾶσι**, 'are posted at intervals'—of a day's journey: in *σταθμοί* no doubt.

7. **τοὺς οὔτε νιφετός κτλ.** Cp. Mark Twain *l.c.* "No matter whether it was winter or summer, raining, snowing, hailing, or sleeting, or whether his 'beat' was a level straight road or a crazy trail over mountain crags and precipices, . . . he must be always ready to leap into the saddle and be off like the wind! There was no idling-time for a pony-rider on duty. He rode fifty miles without stopping, by daylight, moonlight, starlight, or through the blackness of darkness—just as it happened."

8. **μὴ οὐ κατανύσαι**: a simple instance of the idiom, which follows not merely the express negative *οὔτε*, but the implicit negative in *ἔργει* = *κωλύει* = *οὐκ ἐᾷ*. The repetition of *οὔτε* by *οὐκ* is rhetorical: nearly the same sequence in 1. 132. **αὐτῷ** after **τούς** (relative) almost = *ἑκάστῳ*.

11. **διεξέρχεται**: sc. *τὰ ἐντεταλμένα*—presumably tablets, 7. 239 *supra*, or *βυβλία*, 3. 128, 5. 14 (in which passage one *ἱππεύς* apparently carries the *βυβλίον* from sender to recipient).

κατά περ <**ἐν**> **Ἕλλησι ἡ λαμπαδηφορίη**, 'just like in Greece the torch-bearing, with which they conclude the Festival of Hephaistos.' The reference is to such a performance as that described by Plato, *Rep.* 328 (in honour of Bendis), though the *λαμπὰς ἀφ' ἵππων* is there treated as a novelty (*καινόν γε τοῦτο*). Nor is the point of the comparison in Hdt. the presence of horses, but the passing of the torch from one man to another (*λαμπάδια ἔχοντες διαδώσουσιν ἀλλήλοις*). The method described by Pausanias 1. 30. 2 of the race from the Akademeia to the Akropolis, in which each competitor carried a lighted torch (if he could) all the way, would not offer a true analogy. In 6. 105 Hdt. mentions a *λαμπάς* at Athens in honour of Pan—probably of the latter type.

13. **τοῦτο . . καλέουσι Πέρσαι ἀγγαρήιον** has an unfortunately gloss-like

ἡ μὲν δὴ πρώτη ἐς Σοῦσα ἀγγελίη ἀπικομένη, ὡς ἔχοι 99
Ἀθήνας Ξέρξης, ἔτερψε οὕτω δή τι Περσέων τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας ὡς τάς τε ὁδοὺς μυρσίνῃ πάσας ἐστόρεσαν καὶ ἐθυμίων θυμιήματα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν ἐν θυσίῃσί τε καὶ εὐπαθείῃσι. ἡ δὲ δευτέρη σφι ἀγγελίη ἐπεσελθοῦσα συνέχεε οὕτω ὥστε τοὺς κιθῶνας κατηρείξαντο πάντες, βοῇ τε καὶ οἰμωγῇ ἐχρέωντο ἀπλέτῳ, Μαρδόνιον ἐν αἰτίῃ τιθέντες. οὐκ οὕτω δὲ περὶ τῶν νεῶν ἀχθόμενοι ταῦτα οἱ Πέρσαι ἐποίευν ὡς περὶ αὐτῷ Ξέρξῃ δειμαίνοντες.

---

99. 3 ὡς τάς τε: ὥστε τὰς Cobet: ὥστε τάς τε van H. || μυρσίνῃσι *z* 4 αὐτοὶ secl. van H. || ἔσαν *z* || θυσίῃσί: εὐθυμίῃσί Naber: θαλίῃσι? van H. || εὐπαθίῃσι codd. *z* 5 ἐπεσελθοῦσα Reiske, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: ἐπεξελθοῦσα || τούς τε coni. Stein[2], recep. van H. 6 κατηρείξαντο Cobet, Holder, van H., Stein[3]: κατερρήξαντο || καὶ βοῇ coni. Stein[1], recep. van H.: βοῇ δέ τε? Kallenberg || ἐχρέοντο P, van H. 7 αἰτίῃσι P 8 νηῶν **αβ***z*

---

appearance, and might easily be an addition, even if from the author's hand. The fact remains that the word ἀγγαρήιον is also to be read 3. 126, naturally used; cf. note above. It was familiar in Greece before the days of Hdt. So Aischylos, *Agamemnon* 282 φρυκτὸς δὲ φρυκτὸν δεῦρ' ἀπ' ἀγγάρου πυρὸς ἔπεμπεν —of the fire-signals crossing the Aegean; cp. 9. 3 *infra*. ἀγγαρεύειν is found in *N.T.*; *angaria* and *angariare* in Later Latin. Suidas has articles on ἀγγαρεία, ἄγγαρος (*bis*), ἄγγαροι. οἱ ἐκ διαδοχῆς γραμματοφόροι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀστάνδαι. τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα Περσικά. In the Roman Empire the words had come to be used for any compulsory or enforced service. H. C. R. *ap.* Rawl. derives the word from *hakkáreh*, 'a man fit for every sort of work,' 'a messenger' ("a slight unmeritable man, meet to be sent on errands"), and notices that courier dromedaries are still known throughout India and Persia as *karhareh*.

99. 1. **ἡ μὲν δὴ πρώτη ἐς Σοῦσα**: cp. c. 54 *supra*. Hdt. never shows any consciousness that Susa was not a 'Persian' city; in his days it plainly counted in the West as the chief capital of the 'Persian' empire. **τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας**, 'those who had stayed behind' (cp. 5. 61, c. 67 *supra*, 9. 53 *infra*). As if there were but a few of them! The passage may be influenced by scenic and dramatic representations from Phrynichos, or even Aischylos.

3. **μυρσίνῃ**, 'myrtle (boughs),' Att. μυρρίνη, the plant from which not merely wreaths, but a balsamic juice (μύρρα) was procurable; cp. 1. 132, (4. 195), 7. 54.

4. **ἦσαν ἐν**: ἐν εὐπαθείῃσι occurs 1. 22, 191, ἐν θαλίῃσι 3. 27, but ἐν θυσίῃσι is unique (Stein). Schweighaeuser defends ἐν θυσίῃσι here. The conjunction of θυσίαι and εὐπαθεῖαι is no offence; cp. Stallbaum *ad* Plat. *Rep.* 365 a. Aristoph. *Clds.* 328 has θεῶν θυσίαι θαλίαι τε.

5. **ἐπεσελθοῦσα**: cp. 4. 154 of a stepmother; less significantly 1. 37. **συνέχεε** Stein takes to be the aorist, cp. ἔτερψε above. (*Il.* 18. 347 ἐν δ' ἄρ' ὕδωρ ἔχεαν.)

6. **κατηρείξαντο**: cp. 3. 66, Aischyl. *Pers.* 538.

βοῇ . . ἀπλέτῳ: cp. 7. 211 *supra*, 9. 24 *infra*.

7. **Μαρδόνιον ἐν αἰτίῃ τιθέντες**: not for anything specially connected with the ships, but for having urged the king in the first instance to undertake the expedition; the phrase therefore constitutes an implicit reference to 7. 5 ff. *supra*.

περὶ τῶν νεῶν . . περὶ αὐτῷ Ξέρξῃ, 'it was not grief arising about the ships (that had been lost), but fear centred on the king's person (lest he should never return).' The genitive and dative are not mere stylistic variations. Just below, the accusative **περὶ Πέρσας** is, of course, purely locative.

100 Καὶ περὶ Πέρσας μὲν ἦν ταῦτα τὸν πάντα μεταξὺ χρόνον γενόμενον, μέχρι οὗ Ξέρξης αὐτός σφεα ἀπικόμενος ἔπαυσε. Μαρδόνιος δὲ ὁρῶν μὲν Ξέρξην συμφορὴν μεγάλην ἐκ τῆς ναυμαχίης ποιεύμενον, ὑποπτεύων δὲ αὐτὸν δρησμὸν βουλεύειν ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνέων, φροντίσας πρὸς ἑωυτὸν ὡς δώσει δίκην ἀναγνώσας βασιλέα στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καί οἱ κρέσσον εἴη ἀνακινδυνεῦσαι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἢ αὐτὸν καλῶς τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον ὑπὲρ μεγάλων αἰωρηθέντα· πλέον μέντοι ἔφερέ οἱ ἡ γνώμη κατεργάσασθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα· λογισάμενος ὦν ταῦτα προσέφερέ <οἱ> τὸν λόγον τόνδε. "δέσποτα, μήτε λυπέο μήτε συμφορὴν μηδεμίαν μεγάλην ποιεῦ τοῦδε τοῦ γεγονότος εἵνεκα πρήγματος. οὐ γὰρ ξύλων ἀγὼν

100. 1 πάντα τὸν vel τὸν πάντα τὸν Krueger 2 γινόμενον Bekker, van H.: 'an γινόμενα?' Stein[2] || σφεα van H., Stein[3]: σφεας 3 ὁρέων CPz, Stein[1], van H. 5 Ἀθηναίων CP[1]Rz 6 βασιλῆα z 7 κρεῖσσον ABRSV || ἀνακινδυνεύσαντα? van H. || ἢ αὐτὸν . . Ἑλλάδα om. B[1]: eadem bis R 9 πλέων C[1]: πλέω z || οἱ om. B[2] || ἡ om. **B** || κατεργάσθαι V: κατεργάσεσθαι Cobet, Holder 10 οἱ add. Stein[(2) 3], van H. 11 μηδεμίην z || ποιέο van H.

100. 1. ἦν ταῦτα . . μέχρι οὗ . . ἔπαυσε: Hdt. apparently forgets that he is going to retain Xerxes at Sardes a good while; cp. 9. 108 *infra*. This passage again looks as if it might have been borrowed from a scene on the stage. ἦν ταῦτα is a very bald phrase; **γενόμενον** is a remarkable tense, and an unnecessary sense; Stein suggests γινόμενα.

3. **Μαρδόνιος δέ**: this bold analysis of the motives of Mardonios may be compared with the account of the motives of Aristagoras in a somewhat similar situation, 5. 35. Not that the prior passage is of earlier composition, though referring to an earlier date; rather, perhaps, the flight of final verbs there, compared with the procession of participles here, suggests a more accomplished style. Evidently Greek minds were greatly exercised to account for the commission of Mardonios after the Persian defeat at Salamis—reading the situation of September 480 B.C., as they did, too much in the light of after events.

ἐκ τῆς ναυμαχίης . . ἐκ τῶν Ἀθ.: the one ἐκ causal, or material, the other purely local; neither temporal.

4. **δρησμὸν βουλεύειν**: c. 97 *supra*. Hdt. somewhat artfully calls Mardonios as a witness for this libel.

5. **δώσει δίκην**, 'he will be called to account . .'; cp. c. 114 *infra*.

8. **καλῶς τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον ὑπὲρ μεγάλων αἰωρηθέντα**: a stately phrase, exactly descriptive of the actual and, as it were, subsequent fate of Mardonios, which is thus prepared with a touch of tragic irony. Mardonios is, indeed, the real hero of the story in these Books; Xerxes is too capricious, too craven, to incur aught but the comic nemesis, which has already begun in c. 99. Cp. Introduction, § 11. αἰωρηθέντα is better taken with βίον, notwithstanding Dionys. H. 5. 27. 2 οὐκ ἀξιῶ λαθεῖν ἅπαντας αἰωρηθεὶς ὑπὲρ μεγάλων.

9. **πλέον . . ἔφερε**: an exact parallel, 3. 77 ἐγένετο οἷόν τι Δαρείῳ ἡ γνώμη ἔφερε, 'just such an event as Dareios was expecting.' **προσέφερε** just below is inelegant (an 'unconscious iteration'), and **ὁ τὸ πᾶν φέρων** worse still; cp. c. 62 *supra*.

11. **λυπέο . . ποιεῦ**: the force of the middle voice should not be missed, nor the dialectal inconsistency (cp. App. Crit.).

12. **οὐ γὰρ ξύλων κτλ.** Mardonios is made, rightly enough, to assert the *de facto* superiority of the Persian land-forces over the Greek, and the sequel justifies his anticipation (i.e. the writer is wise after the event) that no Greek army would venture to stay his regress. But two points are omitted in the argument of Mardonios: (i.) the question of the commissariat, now the fleet was

ὁ τὸ πᾶν φέρων ἐστὶ ἡμῖν, ἀλλ' ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ ἵππων. σοὶ δὲ οὔτε τις τούτων τῶν τὸ πᾶν σφίσι ἤδη δοκεόντων κατεργάσθαι ἀποβὰς ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν πειρήσεται ἀντιωθῆναι οὔτ' ἐκ τῆς ἠπείρου τῆσδε, οἵ τε ἡμῖν ἠντιώθησαν, ἔδοσαν δίκας. εἰ μέν νυν δοκέει, αὐτίκα πειρώμεθα τῆς Πελοποννήσου· εἰ δὲ καὶ δοκέει ἐπισχεῖν, παρέχει ποιέειν ταῦτα. μηδὲ δυσθύμεε· οὐ γάρ ἐστι Ἕλλησι οὐδεμία ἔκδυσις μὴ οὐ δόντας λόγον τῶν ἐποίησαν νῦν τε καὶ πρότερον εἶναι σοὺς δούλους. μάλιστα μέν νυν ταῦτα ποίεε· εἰ δ' ἄρα τοι βεβούλευται αὐτὸν ἀπελαύνοντα ἀπάγειν τὴν στρατιήν, ἄλλην ἔχω καὶ ἐκ τῶνδε βουλήν. σὺ Πέρσας, βασιλεῦ, μὴ ποιήσῃς καταγελάστους γενέσθαι Ἕλλησι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν Πέρσῃσί τοί τι

14 *τουτέων* z || *σφίσι* Stein, Holder, van H.: *σφι* || *κατεργάσασθαι* **B**dz 18 *παρέχειν* C || *δυσθύμει* libri (sic Stein[1]) 19 *οὐδὲ μία* AB: *οὐδεμίη* z 20 *τοὺς* **B** 21 *ποιέειν* R: *ποιέεν* SV (Holder: 'Is tamen codex [sc. S] perspicue habet *ποίεεν*' Gaisford) 22 *ἀπαγαγεῖν* **B** 24 *οὐδὲ* Stein[2]: *οὐδὲν* || *Πέρσῃσί τοί τι* Valckenaer, Stein[2], Holder: *Πέρσῃσί τοι* Stein[1], van H.: *Πέρσῃσι τοισίδε* Reiske: *Πέρσῃσι τεοῖσι* Schweighaeuser: *τοῖσι πέρσησι* **B**: *πέρσηισι τοῖσι* **a** etc.

broken; (ii.) the possibility of an attack by the Greeks on the bridges. With the landsman's contempt for *ξύλα* cp. Thuc. 4. 11. 4 (of Brasidas) *ἐβόα λέγων ὡς οὐκ εἰκὸς εἴη ξύλων φειδομένους τοὺς πολεμίους ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ περιιδεῖν τεῖχος πεποιημένους*, and Xenoph. *Hell.* 1. 1. 24 *μὴ ἀθυμεῖν ἕνεκα ξύλων* (Pharnabazo loq. ref. van H.).

14. **τῶν τὸ πᾶν σφίσι ἤδη δοκεόντων κατεργάσθαι**: this is 'without prejudice,' and does not describe the attitude of the Greeks as recorded above c. 96. Perhaps the subsequent action—or inaction—of the Greeks provoked the taunt as a legitimate comment on their conduct. But in view of the achievement of Aristeides on Psyttaleia Mardonios could hardly have ventured upon such a remark.

16. **οἵ τε ἡ. ἠν. ἔδοσαν δίκας** contains of course a reference to Thermopylai, so notorious a story that even the locality of the affair is taken for granted, and also to the capture of the Akropolis. But the reference could hardly have been made in such unqualified terms.

17. **πειρώμεθα τῆς Π.**: the alternative the speaker apparently prefers; yet he does not adopt it next year, when in supreme command—and wisely. He will hardly have proposed it now.

εἰ δὲ καί: an alternative lies in **δέ**, an adversative in **καί**.

19. **οὐ γὰρ ἔστι . . οὐδεμία . . μὴ οὐ**: a simple or primary example of the doubled negative, though **ἔκδυσις** itself perhaps conveys something of a negation; still, the idiom would equally stand with *ὁδός*, *ἐλπίς*, or any purely positive idea. In other words, the cumulative negation is not attained by any strict cancelling of one negative against another, but is a purely idiomatic result of the sense of accumulation. *λόγον δοῦναι* here seems a variant for *δίκην δοῦναι*—and might almost suggest a civil rather than a criminal process!

21. **εἰ δ' ἄρα** suggests the more probable alternative: **καὶ ἐκ τῶνδε**, 'also suitable to this course' (Stein). The phrase has been taken to mean *vel ex his quomodo tu bene evadas* (Baehr), or, simply of time, *post haec.*

24. **ἐν Πέρσῃσι** might mean 'at home in Persia'—rather a far cry, and what of all Asia, and the rest of the empire? Perhaps the words may be taken in the same sense as the vulgate *ἐν τοῖσι Π.*: *ubi Persae pugnarunt*, Baehr, or *Persarum culpa*, Valckenaer, which is supported by Xerxes' own words c. 101 *infra*, and indeed by the immediate context here.

δεδήληται τῶν πρηγμάτων, οὐδ' ἐρέεις ὅκου ἐγενόμεθα ἄνδρες κακοί. εἰ δὲ Φοίνικές τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ Κύπριοί τε καὶ Κίλικες κακοὶ ἐγένοντο, οὐδὲν πρὸς Πέρσας τοῦτο προσήκει τὸ πάθος. ἤδη ὦν, ἐπειδὴ οὐ Πέρσαι τοι αἴτιοι εἰσί, ἐμοὶ πείθεο· εἴ τοι δέδοκται μὴ παραμένειν, σὺ μὲν ἐς ἤθεα τὰ σεωυτοῦ ἀπέλαυνε τῆς στρατιῆς ἀπάγων τὸ πολλόν, ἐμὲ δὲ σοὶ χρὴ τὴν Ἑλλάδα παρασχεῖν δεδουλωμένην, τριήκοντα μυριάδας τοῦ στρατοῦ ἀπολεξάμενον."

101 *Ταῦτα ἀκούσας Ξέρξης ὡς ἐκ κακῶν ἐχάρη τε καὶ ἥσθη, πρὸς Μαρδόνιόν τε βουλευσάμενος ἔφη ὑποκρινέεσθαι ὁκότερον ποιήσει τούτων. ὡς δὲ ἐβουλεύετο ἅμα Περσέων τοῖσι ἐπικλήτοισι, ἔδοξέ οἱ καὶ Ἀρτεμισίην ἐς συμβουλίην μεταπέμψασθαι, ὅτι πρότερον ἐφαίνετο μούνη νοέουσα τὰ ποιητέα ἦν. ὡς δὲ ἀπίκετο ἡ Ἀρτεμισίη, μεταστησάμενος τοὺς*

---

25 *ἐρεῖς* codd. *z*, Holder, van H. 29 *μὴ* om. C ‖ *παραμενέειν* **B** ‖ *τὰς εωυτοῦ* (sic) **a** 30 *δέ σοι* libri, Holder : *δέ τοι* van H. **101.** 2 *ὑποκρινέεσθαι* Bredow : *ὑποκρινεῖσθαι* van H. : *ἀποκρινεῖσθαι* codd. : *ἀποκρινέεσθαι z* 3 *τουτέων z* ‖ *ἐβουλεύσατο*? van H. 4 *ἐπὶ συμβουλὴν* **B**P*z*, van H.

---

25. **ὅκου ἐγενόμεθα**, 'that we Persians in any case proved . .'

26. **Φοίνικες . . Κίλικες**: just as in Artemisia's speech c. 68 *supra*, except that Mardonios substitutes 'Phoenicians' for 'Pamphylians.' This reproduction is hardly good art or history. A Persian would more probably have spoken ill of the 'Ionians'; Hdt. voices Greek prejudice. Besides, his account of the battle (cp. c. 90 *supra*) may have affected his composition of this speech.

27. **οὐδὲν πρὸς Πέρσας . . τὸ πάθος**: yet what of the *Epibatai*? What of the Persians on Psyttaleia? Hdt. in composing this speech for Mardonios has sacrificed historic probability to the ethical interest. Mardonios is ultra-Persian: the Persians are four times paraded in half a dozen lines!

29. **ἤθεα τὰ σεωυτοῦ**: cp. 4. 76, 80, 5. 14, 15, etc. Persia might be meant, or perhaps Asia, more at large.

30. **ἐμὲ δὲ σοὶ χρή**. The proposal put into the mouth of Mardonios is no unreasonable one: he was to get rid (1) of the king, (2) of the mob (*τὴν στρατιήν*), (3) of the fleet, but to have a large force of picked men wherewith to effect the conquest of Hellas. The dismissal of the fleet was, perhaps, a doubtful expedient, yet probably necessary to cover the Asiatic coast, and to prevent a movement in Ionia, or the larger islands. The figure 300,000 is an over-estimate, unless he retained the whole land-forces, which is improbable. Cp. Appendix II. § 5.

101. 1. **ὡς ἐκ κακῶν ἐχάρη τε καὶ ἥσθη**: a merely relative joy. Cp. Thuc. 7. 42. 2 *τῷ δὲ προτέρῳ στρατεύματι ὡς ἐκ κακῶν ῥώμη τις ἐγεγένητο* (Stein).

2. **βουλευσάμενος . . ὑποκρινέεσθαι**, 'he will let him know after consultation.' Or, 'before replying, he must first take advice'—the participle is predicative.

3. **Περσέων τοῖσι ἐπικλήτοισι**: the privy councillors, cp. 7. 8 *supra*, Mardonios no doubt among them; so too *τοὺς συμβούλους Περσέων* just below. **ἐβουλεύετο**, imperfect. Artemisia was not present at the Privy Council of Persians. The Council of War had been a different matter; cp. c. 67 *supra*.

5. **ὅτι πρότερον ἐφαίνετο . . ἦν**: a reference to c. 68 *supra*, an acquaintance with which is implied. Hdt. writes for a reading public.

6. **μεταστησάμενος**: cp. c. 81 *supra*. The king pays Artemisia the compliment of dismissing not merely his councillors, but his guard of 'Immortals.' Apparently only Xerxes and Artemisia were present at this interview, yet Hdt. can report

ἄλλους τούς τε συμβούλους Περσέων καὶ τοὺς δορυφόρους, ἔλεξε Ξέρξης τάδε. “κελεύει με Μαρδόνιος μένοντα αὐτοῦ πειρᾶσθαι τῆς Πελοποννήσου, λέγων ὥς μοι Πέρσαι τε καὶ ὁ πεζὸς στρατὸς οὐδενὸς μεταίτιοι πάθεός εἰσί, ἀλλὰ βουλομένοισί σφι γένοιτ' ἂν ἀπόδεξις. ἐμὲ ὦν ἢ ταῦτα κελεύει ποιέειν, ἢ αὐτὸς ἐθέλει τριήκοντα μυριάδας ἀπολεξάμενος τοῦ στρατοῦ παρασχεῖν μοι τὴν Ἑλλάδα δεδουλωμένην, αὐτὸν δέ με κελεύει ἀπελαύνειν σὺν τῷ λοιπῷ στρατῷ ἐς ἤθεα τὰ ἐμά. σὺ ὦν ἐμοί, καὶ γὰρ περὶ τῆς ναυμαχίης εὖ συνεβούλευσας τῆς γενομένης οὐκ ἐῶσα ποιέεσθαι, νῦν τε συμβούλευσον ὁκότερα ποιέων ἐπιτύχω εὖ βουλευσάμενος.” ὃ μὲν ταῦτα 102
συνεβουλεύετο, ἣ δὲ λέγει τάδε. “βασιλεῦ, χαλεπὸν μὲν

9 *ἀποπειρᾶσθαι* z 11 *ἀπόδιξις* A: *ἀπόδειξις* R 13 *ἐμοὶ* S
14 *λυπῶι* Apr.B[1] || *τάμά* z 16 *τε*: *ἄγε*? Stein 17 *ποιέω* C

their *tête-à-tête* conversation: from which had he heard it? Had Artemisia let it out in Halikarnassos?

8. **αὐτοῦ**, locative adverb, ‘on the spot.’ *κελεύειν* may be used of the action of a political inferior; cp. 1. 116.

9. **Πέρσαι τε καί**, ‘the Persians, that is,’ cp. c. 100 *supra*. **ὁ πεζὸς στρατός** includes the cavalry.

10. **ἀλλὰ βουλομένοισί σφι γένοιτ' ἂν ἀπόδεξις**, ‘as they would be glad to have an opportunity of demonstrating’—viz. that *οὐδενὸς (μετ)αίτιοι πάθεός εἰσί*—that ‘the naval contingents alone were to blame for any distressing occurrence.’ With the construction cp. c. 14. 3 *supra*. The *ἀλλά* is adversative, where a relative might be expected. *ἀπόδεξις* is here used in a sense approximate to that in 1. 1 (*ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις*), not to that in 1. 207 *ἡμῖν λείπεται ἀπόδεξις ἔργων μεγάλων*—though had *ἔργων μεγάλων* occurred here a good sense would have been obtained.

12. **τριήκοντα μυριάδας**: the second time this figure is given as the number of Mardonios' army; cp. c. 100 *ad f.* and c. 113 *infra*.

14. **τῷ λοιπῷ στρατῷ**=*τῆς στρατιῆς τὸ πολλόν* c. 100 *supra*; cp. 7. 40, 55 *supra*. **ἤθεα** repeated from c. 100.

16. **οὐκ ἐῶσα**, ‘in opposing,’ or ‘in trying to prevent.’

νῦν τε . . βουλευσάμενος. Stein takes exception to *νῦν τε* as un-Herodotean in this sense (*nunc quoque*: cp. Thuc. 1. 69. 2 *μόλις δὲ νῦν γε ξυνήλθομεν καὶ οὐδὲ νῦν ἐπὶ φανεροῖς*), Hdt. generally using the combination to introduce *begruendete Adhortativ-saetze*. But the sense here is good. The remainder of the sentence is rather complicated: ‘Advise me by doing which of the two I shall succeed in having been well advised’—by Mardonios—i.e. which of the alternatives recommended by Mardonios would you advise me to adopt? The word *ἐπιτυγχάνω* appears to be rather a blot on the expression, used merely as equivalent to *τυγχάνω*. The sentence would be complete if it ran *ὁκότερα ποιέων* (or *ποιήσας*) *ἐπιτύχω*—i.e. *κότερα ποιήσας ἐπιτεύξομαι*: cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 5. 19 *ἐκ τούτου δὲ μάλα καὶ τἆλλα ἐπετύγχανεν Ἰφικράτης*: (*αἱ ἐπιτετευγμέναι πράξεις* successful actions, Polyb. 6. 53. 2). It would perhaps be possible to take the word here in its fuller force, and understand *εὖ βουλευσάμενος* as epexegetical; but the absence of a copula, the difference of tense, the whole rhythm of the sentence, and the repetition of the formula in c. 103 *infra* (*λέγουσα . . ἐπετύγχανε*), are against such a construction. In any case **ποιέων** is the real predicate.

102. 2. **χαλεπὸν μὲν ἐστὶ συμβουλευομένῳ τυχεῖν τὰ ἄριστα εἴπασαν**: “merito laudant Stephani versionem: *me tibi consulenti optimum dare consilium difficile est*,” Baehr. But this ‘lauded’ version misses the point; it should have run: *viro consulenti optimum dare consilium mulieri difficile est*! Nor is there any *me tibi* in the Greek! Cp. *αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες* c. 88 *supra*, and *εἰ καὶ πάντες καὶ πᾶσαι συνεβούλευον αὐτῷ infra* c. 103.

ἐστὶ συμβουλευομένῳ τυχεῖν τὰ ἄριστα εἴπασαν, ἐπὶ μέντοι τοῖσι κατήκουσι πρήγμασι δοκέει μοι αὐτὸν μέν σε ἀπελαύνειν ὀπίσω, Μαρδόνιον *δέ, εἰ ἐθέλει τε καὶ ὑποδέκεται ταῦτα ποιήσειν, αὐτοῦ καταλιπεῖν σὺν τοῖσι ἐθέλει. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἤν καταστρέψηται τὰ φησὶ θέλειν καί οἱ προχωρήσῃ τὰ νοέων λέγει, σὸν τὸ ἔργον ὦ δέσποτα γίνεται· οἱ γὰρ σοὶ δοῦλοι κατεργάσαντο. τοῦτο δὲ ἢν τὰ ἐναντία τῆς* Μαρδονίου *γνώμης γένηται, οὐδεμία συμφορὴ μεγάλη ἔσται σέο τε περιεόντος καὶ ἐκείνων τῶν πρηγμάτων [περὶ οἶκον τὸν σόν]· ἢν γὰρ σύ τε περιῇς καὶ οἶκος ὁ σός, πολλοὺς πολλάκις ἀγῶνας δραμέονται περὶ σφέων αὐτῶν οἱ* Ἕλληνες. Μαρδονίου *δέ, ἤν τι πάθῃ, λόγος οὐδεὶς γίνεται, οὐδέ τι νικῶντες οἱ* Ἕλληνες *νικῶσι, δοῦλον σὸν ἀπολέσαντες· σὺ δέ, τῶν εἵνεκα τὸν στόλον ἐποιήσαο, πυρώσας τὰς* Ἀθήνας *ἀπελᾷς.*"

---

102. 3 *τοι τυχεῖν* coni. Stein², rec. van H. 4 *μὲν σὲ* codd. 5 *ἐθέλοι* z ‖ *ὑποδέδεκται* **B** ('non male' van H.) 6 *καταλειπεῖν* B ‖ *τοῦτο . . θέλειν* om. R 7 *τά σφισι* CP ‖ *θέλειν* A²B : *θέλει* A¹CP : *ἐθέλει* SVz ‖ *προχωρήσει* **B**d : *προχωρήσοι* z 8 *νοέειν*? Stein² 10 *οὐδὲ μία* AB : *οὐδεμίῃ* z 11 *περὶ . . σὸν* secl. Stein², Holder, van H. 13 *αὐτέων* z 16 *ἐποιήσω* codd. z ‖ *ἀπέλασον* Naber

---

3. **ἐπὶ τοῖσι κατήκουσι πρήγμασι**: cp. c. 19 *supra*, 5. 49. **δοκέει μοι**, it seems to me advisable.

6. **σὺν τοῖσι ἐθέλει**: sc. *σὺν ἐκείνοις οὓς ἐθέλει* (*ἀπολέξασθαι*, or *κατέχειν*), i.e. the 300,000 *λογάδες*. Cp. *τὰ φησὶ θέλειν* just below: sc. *καταστρέψασθαι*.

τοῦτο μὲν . . τοῦτο δέ: cp. cc. 76, 60 *supra*.

7. **τὰ νοέων λέγει**: what he has in view when speaking—the predicative participle.

8. **σὸν τὸ ἔργον**: even on republican (but religious) principles the same formula applied to the Roman who won a victory *alienis auspiciis*: the victory was the doing of the Imperator, not of the legate. The establishment of Monarchy, of a sole Imperator, tended in the direction suggested by Artemisia's too servile flattery. So Japanese victories are due to the virtues of the Mikado (cp. *Times*, April 18, 1904, p. 5), perhaps on some esoteric principle not fully understood in the individualistic West.

12. **ἢν γὰρ σύ τε περιῇς . . οἱ Ἕλληνες**: this prophecy might seem to enforce the moral, hinted above c. 97, that it was a vast mistake to have let the king escape home out of Europe. Had the Greeks caught the king, and ended the dynasty, they would have been saved a deal of subsequent trouble! On the other hand, the prophecy can hardly be regarded as altogether happy: Xerxes escaped, but the Hellenes, after Plataia, can hardly be said with truth to have had many bouts to stand, many races or risks to run, *περὶ σφέων αὐτῶν*, except what they incurred by invading the king's dominions! Is the passage a specimen of Hdt.'s irony?

13. **Μαρδονίου δὲ . . λόγος οὐδεὶς γίνεται**: cp. 4. 135 *τῶν ἦν ἐλάχιστος ἀπολλυμένων λόγος*. But Mardonios remains to all time a more interesting and real figure than Xerxes himself. Cp. Introduction, § 11.

14. **οὐδέ τι νικῶντες οἱ Ἕλληνες νικῶσι**, *τι* with the verb: *νικῶντες* = *ἐὰν νικῶσι*, the participle doing duty for a conditional sentence. This unfavourable verdict on Plataia is not the verdict of Hdt., cp. 9. 64 *infra*. **ἀπελᾷς** is future, and absolute; cp. 7. 32 *supra*, 1. 207 etc.

16. **πυρώσας τὰς Ἀθήνας**. Neither Artemisia nor Mardonios have made any allusion to the assault on Delphi and its miserable failure: an unconscious evidence of the good faith of Hdt. and the fictitious character of that legend; perhaps, too, of its bearing no part in

Ἥσθη τε δὴ τῇ συμβουλίῃ Ξέρξης· λέγουσα γὰρ ἐπετύγ- 103
χανε τά περ αὐτὸς ἐνόεε. οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ πάντες καὶ πᾶσαι συνεβούλευον αὐτῷ μενειν, ἔμενε ἂν δοκέειν ἐμοί· οὕτω καταρρωδήκεε. ἐπαινέσας δὲ τὴν Ἀρτεμισίην, ταύτην μὲν ἀποστέλλει ἄγουσαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς παῖδας ἐς Ἔφεσον· νόθοι γὰρ
τινὲς παῖδές οἱ συνέσποντο. συνέπεμπε δὲ τοῖσι παισὶ φύλακον 104
Ἑρμότιμον, γένος μὲν ἐόντα Πηδασέα, φερόμενον δὲ οὐ τὰ δεύτερα τῶν εὐνούχων παρὰ βασιλέι· [οἱ δὲ Πηδασέες οἰκέουσι

---

103. 1 δὴ om. **B** || συμβουλῇ **B**Pz, Holder, van H. 2 ἐνόει van H.: ἐπενόεε z || καὶ πᾶσαι suspecta habet Kallenberg 3 μενέειν C 4 καταρρωιδήκεε P || ταύτην τὴν **B** 5 τοὺς om. **a** 6 συνέσποντο **a**: συνέποντο C **104.** 2 πηδασσέα B 3 βασιλεῖ AB || οἱ δὲ . . Ἑρμότιμος ἦν damn. Valckenaer, secl. Stein, Holder, e textu eiec. van H.

---

the original draft of the Books. The burning of Athens is an incontestable fact; but cp. 9. 13 *infra*.

103. 1. **ἥσθη τε.** The advice of Artemisia was a positive pleasure to Xerxes; cp. c. 101 *ad init.*; it squared so exactly with his own ideas! **λέγουσα γὰρ ἐπετύγχανε**: cp. c. 101 *ad fin.* The **τε** here has no *καί* following: the parenthetic expression of Hdt.'s own opinion (**δοκέειν ἐμοί**), that all the men and women in creation could not have persuaded Xerxes to remain, a little deranges the grammar of his narrative (which should have run on *καὶ ἐπαινέσας*).

3. **οὕτω καταρρωδήκεε,** 'so utterly was he overcome with terror'—the pl.p. is rather intensive than temporal in character. *οὕτω*: cp. c. 98.

5. **ἐς Ἔφεσον**: the terminal port of the Royal Road; cp. 5. 54. Artemisia doubtless went by sea; perhaps on the very night after the battle.

6. **οἱ**: sc. *Ξέρξῃ*, as the *αὐτοῦ παῖδας* just before makes clear. *ἑωυτοῦ* might have been expected there; Hdt. treats the king (Stein remarks) as the remoter of two subjects, and so prefers the demonstrative to the possessive pronoun; cp. c. 87 *supra*, where, however, *ἡ δὲ αὐτῆς* is in a parenthesis.

The only queen-wife of Xerxes was (so far as we know) Amestris; cp. 7. 61, 114 *supra*, 9. 109 *infra*, by whom he had four sons (including Artaxerxes his successor; cp. 7. 106, 151 *supra*) and two daughters; cp. Rawlinson, iv. 255. Dareios is the only other son named by Hdt.; cp. 9. 108. None of these sons of Xerxes will have been old enough to serve on this expedition. The fact that the *νόθοι* were sent home with Artemisia would suggest, what the probable age of Xerxes would confirm, that the *παῖδες* in question were quite young. The commission was no doubt a mark of royal favour, and recorded as such; yet is there no 'malice' in Hdt.'s notice of this *exit* of Artemisia?

104. 2. **Ἑρμότιμον**: the name is doubtless formed in honour of the god Hermes (not the river Hermos), and is borne by several historical persons (Aspasia's father, Plutarch, *Per.* 24, a philosopher of Klazomenai, prior to Anaxagoras, Aristot. *Metaph.* 1. 3, 984 B, to say nothing of the later Stoic, who gives his name to a Dialogue of Lucian's). **γένος**, 'by birth' a man of Pedasa (*infra*) *alias* Pedasos, or Pedason, 5. 121—'second to none' of the 'chamberlains' at the court (or 'in the king's eyes'). **φέρεσθαι τὰ δεύτερα**, a metaphor from the race-course, *Iliad* 23. 537 ff.

3. **εὐνοῦχοι**, 7. 187 *supra*, is a strictly Hellenic term for a thoroughly un-Hellenic institution, at least in the classic period = *οἱ τὴν εὐνὴν ἔχοντες*. From the miserable fate of these confidential slaves emasculation was indissolubly associated with the word, and so completely domineered the merely etymological meaning that Aristotle (no humorist) applies the term to fruits without seed (cp. L. & S. *sub voc.*). Rawlinson's idea that Hermotimos exhibits the first historical instance of the great position of the Chamberlains, and that the influence of the *Seraglio* first made itself felt in the reign of Xerxes,

ὑπὲρ Ἁλικαρνησσοῦ· ἐν δὲ τοῖσι Πηδάσοισι τουτέοισι τοιόνδε συμφέρεται πρῆγμα γίνεσθαι· ἐπεὰν τοῖσι ἀμφικτυόσι πᾶσι τοῖσι ἀμφὶ ταύτης οἰκέουσι τῆς πόλιος μέλλῃ τι ἐντὸς χρόνου ἔσεσθαι χαλεπόν, τότε ἡ ἱερείη αὐτόθι τῆς Ἀθηναίης φύει
105 *πώγωνα μέγαν. τοῦτο δέ σφι δὶς ἤδη ἐγένετο. ἐκ τούτων δὴ τῶν Πηδασέων ὁ Ἑρμότιμος ἦν] τῷ μεγίστῃ τίσις ἤδη ἀδικηθέντι ἐγένετο πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. ἁλόντα γὰρ*

4 ἁλικαρνησοῦ **a** || Πηδασέοισι z || τούτοισι **β**Pz, Holder 5 φέρεται **β**Pz, Holder 7 ἱρέη **β** **105.** 1 τουτέων z

is not merely contrary to the evidence of Ktesias, *Pers.* 5, 9, 11, 20 (ed. Gilmore, §§ 36, 40, 42, 51, etc.), but in itself improbable. Hdt. himself mentions *τῶν εὐνούχων τοὺς πιστοτάτους* at the court of Astyages 1. 117, and of Amasis 2. 4, and the large harems of the oriental kings will have employed these unfortunates in still earlier ages. Xenoph. *Kyrop.* 7. 5 (of course) ascribes the institution to Kyros.

οἱ δὲ Πηδασέες — ἐγένετο. This passage occurs, or recurs, almost *totidem verbis* in 1. 175. Are both passages genuine? If not, which of the two is genuine? Or are both spurious? Rawlinson accepts them both, seeing no more difficulty in such a dittograph by author than by copyist. Valckenaer first challenged this passage and regarded the genuine text as having run *παρὰ βασιλέι, τῷ μεγίστῃ τίσις κτλ.* Stein adopts and develops his arguments: (1) The notice suits the context better in Book 1 (where Hdt. is recording the resistance offered to Harpagos by the Pedasians). (2) Strabo 611, in citing, cites from Bk. 1, not from this passage. (3) The phraseology is not thoroughly Herodotean, and betrays (Stein adds) by incorrect turns the amateur of the Hadrianic age: thus (*a*) for *αὐτοῖσι τε καὶ τοῖσι περιοίκοισι* the interpolator here has *τοῖσι ἀμφικτυόσι*—leaving out *αὐτοῖσί*; (*b*) *πᾶσι* is an addition, and an exaggeration; (*c*) the preposition is incorrectly used, with genitive, of place, probably suggested by the falsified *ἀμφικτυόσι*; (*d*) *ἐντὸς χρόνου* is *de trop* (perhaps suggested by *ἑκὰς χρόνου* c. 144 *infra*, Stein); (*e*) *χαλεπόν* is the forger's variant for the Herodotean *ἀνεπιτήδειον*; (*f*) so too *φύει* for *ἴσχει*; (*g*) *συμφέρεται* is also hardly in order. These arguments are cogent. (*h*) The most remarkable difference between the two passages is that the miracle has happened *δὶς* here, in Bk. 8, as against *τρὶς* there in Bk. 1. That is regarded as an oversight: a curious one. Had the interpolator held the opinion that the 8th Bk., or the story of the Persian war, had been composed by Hdt. previously to the composition of the rest of the work, or of Bk. 1, he could not have forged a better bit of evidence! Moreover, he has inserted this note on the Pedasians here (by that theory at the earliest possible chance) rather than in Bk. 5. 121, or Bk. 6. 20, in either of which contexts the note would be more consonant with the context. It is impossible to maintain the authenticity of this passage in view of the objections; the other, on the testimony of Strabo, is genuine. This verdict sacrifices on the altar of truth a telling argument in favour of the priority of these Books. Fortunately, enough remains to prove it. Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

105. 2. τῷ μεγίστῃ τίσις ἤδη: almost more forcible than *μεγίστῃ δὴ τίσις*—cp. *πάντων ἀνδρῶν ἤδη κτλ.* c. 106 *infra.* The story of this unparalleled *τίσις, δίκη*, is in Hdt.'s best manner, or at least in a thoroughly characteristic vein, with the moral which he loves. Whether it originally stood in this place might be doubted; incidentally the view is fully endorsed that the king's objective was "Athens" (cp. c. 106 *ad init.*).

3. **τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.** This formula occurs five times in these Books, as from Hdt.'s own pen (7. 20, 8. 105, 124, 9. 37, 64), twice on the lips of his *dramatis personae* (7. 27 a Persian; 9. 78 an Aiginetan). Cp. *ὅσον ἡμ. ἴδ.* 7. 111, and contrast *τῶν ἐγὼ οἶδα* 7. 238. It might well have occurred in 7. 70 *οἱ δ' ἐκ τῆς Λιβύης . . ἀνθρώπων*: and again 9. 35 *μοῦνοι δὲ . . πολιῆται.* Hdt. will not add *ἀνδρῶν* here, or even *ἀνθρώπων.*

αὐτὸν ὑπὸ πολεμίων καὶ πωλεόμενον ὠνέεται Πανιώνιος ἀνὴρ Χῖος, ὃς τὴν ζόην κατεστήσατο ἀπ' ἔργων ἀνοσιωτάτων· ὅκως γὰρ κτήσαιτο παῖδας εἴδεος ἐπαμμένους, ἐκταμὼν ἀγινέων ἐπώλεε ἐς Σάρδις τε καὶ Ἔφεσον χρημάτων μεγάλων. παρὰ γὰρ τοῖσι βαρβάροισι τιμιώτεροι εἰσὶ οἱ εὐνοῦχοι πίστιος εἵνεκα τῆς πάσης τῶν ἐνορχίων. ἄλλους τε δὴ ὁ Πανιώνιος ἐξέταμε πολλούς, ἅτε ποιεύμενος ἐκ τούτου τὴν ζόην, καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦτον. καὶ οὐ γὰρ τὰ πάντα ἐδυστύχεε ὁ Ἑρμότιμος, ἀπικνέεται ἐκ τῶν Σαρδίων παρὰ βασιλέα μετ' ἄλλων δώρων, χρόνου δὲ προϊόντος πάντων τῶν εὐνούχων ἐτιμήθη μάλιστα παρὰ Ξέρξῃ. ὡς δὲ τὸ στράτευμα τὸ Περσικὸν ὅρμα βασιλεὺς **106**
ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐὼν ἐν Σάρδισι, ἐνθαῦτα καταβὰς κατὰ δή

---

4 *παιώνιος* **B** 5 *ζώην* C : *ζωὴν* **B** (cum ό supersc. R) || *κατεκτήσατο* Cobet, van H. 6 *ἐκταμὼν* Reiske, Stein[3] : *ἐκτάμνων* 7 *ἐπώλεε ἀγινέων* ? Stein[2] || *σάρδιάς τε καὶ ἐς* **B** 9 *εἵνεκεν* RS : *εἵνεκε* V || *ἐνορχϊέων* **B** : *ἐνορχέων* Pz 10 *ποιεόμενος* **B** || *τουτέων* z || *ζώην* C 13 *μάλιστα ἐτιμήθη παρὰ βασιλεῖ ξέρξη* (sic) **B** **106.** 1 *ὤρμα* **a**, Stein[1] || *ὁ βασιλεὺς* z 2 *ἐνθαῦτα δὴ* (*δὶ* R) **B**

ἁλόντα . . ὑπὸ πολεμίων suggests *prima facie* a misfortune of war; the Ionian revolt (498–494 B.C.) from 15–18 years previous to the date required for this story seems to offer a likely enough occasion. Cp. the threats of the barbarians and their recorded fulfilment, 6. 9, 32. (Stein, however, suggests a piratical kidnapping.)

4. **Πανιώνιος ἀνὴρ Χῖος**: Panionios, a man and a Chian. He did not remain an *ἀνήρ*. His name is, perhaps, significant of the 'Panionic' ambitions of the period, which produced the 'Ionic Revolt': his *ethnicon* suggests that the notorious wealth of the Chians was partly due to slave-trading; cp. Thucyd. 8. 40. 2, and the whole passage on Chios, Athenaeus 6. 86–91 = 265 ff. (where *inter alia* this passage of Hdt. is cited).

5. **τὴν ζόην κατεστήσατο**: cp. *τὸν βίον κτησάμενε* c. 106 *infra*. Panionios was not the only Greek that had engaged in this trade; the Corinthians were perhaps tarred with the same brush; cp. 3. 48.

6. **εἴδεος ἐπαμμένους**, 'possessed of beauty.' L. & S. give *ἐπάπτω* as Ionic for *ἐφάπτω*. Homer, at least, only contains the aspirated forms of the verb. The participle is perf. (passive in form, middle in force).

ἐκταμὼν ἀγινέων: the double participles are rather awkward, but not so awkward as if both were in the present (defensible as indicating repeated acts?); cp. App. Crit. *ἀγινέων* is itself a frequentative of *ἄγω* (used in the middle 7. 33 *supra*); here perhaps especially suitable for 'bringing to market.'

7. **ἐς Σάρδις τε καὶ Ἔφεσον**: the great markets for such wares, from their position on the Royal Road (*vide* 5. 52–54); and also perhaps with a local demand for the temples of Kybele and Artemis (Stein).

παρὰ γὰρ τοῖσι βαρβάροισι κτλ.: the difference between Hellenic and Asiatic culture is emphatic; the remark is, however, only intended to apply to slaves.

8. **πίστιος . . τῆς πάσης**, faithfulness, fidelity, in all respects. For the antithesis *εὐνοῦχος*, *ἔνορχις* cp. 6. 32 (*ὄρχις* subst. 4. 109).

106. 1. **τὸ στράτευμα τὸ Περσικόν**: the word *στράτευμα* is used both for 'expedition' and 'army' or 'host'; here perhaps (with *ὅρμα*) rather in the latter sense. It was a 'Persian' army, not merely politically, but in the main ethnically, while at Sardes in 481–480 B.C. (cp. 7. 26, 40), and this passage is an undesigned homage to the fact.

2. **καταβάς**: from inland to the coast.

κατὰ δή τι πρῆγμα, 'on some (other) business.'—Perhaps Panionios

τι πρῆγμα ὁ Ἑρμότιμος ἐς γῆν τὴν Μυσίην, τὴν Χῖοι μὲν νέμονται Ἀταρνεὺς δὲ καλέεται, εὑρίσκει τὸν Πανιώνιον ἐνθαῦτα. ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτὸν πολλοὺς καὶ φιλίους λόγους, πρῶτα μέν οἱ καταλέγων ὅσα αὐτὸς δι' ἐκεῖνον ἔχοι ἀγαθά, δεύτερα δέ οἱ ὑπισχνεύμενος ἀντὶ τούτων ὅσα μιν ἀγαθὰ ποιήσει, ἢν κομίσας τοὺς οἰκέτας οἰκέῃ ἐκείνῃ, ὥστε ὑποδεξάμενον ἄσμενον τοὺς λόγους τὸν Πανιώνιον κομίσαι τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα. ὡς δὲ ἄρα πανοικίῃ μιν περιέλαβε, ἔλεγε ὁ Ἑρμότιμος τάδε. "ὦ πάντων ἀνδρῶν ἤδη μάλιστα ἀπ' ἔργων ἀνοσιωτάτων τὸν βίον κτησάμενε, τί σε ἐγὼ κακὸν ἢ αὐτὸς ἢ τῶν ἐμῶν τις σὲ προγόνων ἐργάσατο, ἢ σὲ ἢ τῶν σῶν τινα, ὅτι με ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς ἐποίησας τὸ μηδὲν εἶναι; ἐδόκεές

---

3 *μὲν* om. **B**, Holder 4 *ἀταρνέος* **B** : Ἀταρνεὸς Holder || *παιώνιον* **B** 5 *ἔλεγε ἄρα* **B** 7 *τουτέων* z 8 *ποιήσει* **B** : *ποιήσειεν* || *κομισάμενος* **B** || *οἰκέτας* : *παῖδας* CPz || *ἐκεῖ* van H. || *ἀποδεξάμενον* coni. Stein[1], rec. van H. 9 *παιώνιον* **B** || *τά* <*τε*> van H. 12 *σε* del. Cobet, Holder, van H. 13 *τίς σε* CPz, Stein[1,2] : *τις* **B**, Holder, van H. : *τις σε* || *προγόνων* om. **B**, Holder, van H.

---

was a reformed character by this time, with a wife and family of his own, and only engaged in lawful trade: all the more terrible the vengeance. But l. 11 *infra* hardly supports this.

3. **γῆν τὴν Μυσίην**: the term is partitive or restrictive, and plainly not used with the same extension as in 7. 42 *supra*, as the next words prove.

τὴν Χῖοι μὲν νέμονται Ἀταρνεὺς δὲ καλέεται. Cp. 1. 160 *χῶρος τῆς Μυσίης Λέσβου ἀντίος.* The dreadful story of this 'field of blood' is told 1. 160. Cp. 7. 42 *supra.* The specification here was hardly necessary after that passage. The notice here is probably reproduced from the 'Source,' and without any memory of the other passages. The absence of a cross reference is suggestive of Hdt.'s method of work.

4. **εὑρίσκει**: not that he was looking for him; it is a casual meeting apparently.

5. **ἐπιγνούς**: as Hermotimos 'recognizes' his tormentor he will not have been a mere child at the time of his capture.

6. **καταλέγων**, of a series, or list; cp. 7. 110.

δι' ἐκεῖνον, 'thanks to him.'

7. **ὑπισχνεύμενος**: Hdt. apparently uses freely both forms *ὑπισχνέομαι* and *ὑπίσχομαι.* Cp. 7. 104, 168, 9. 109, 2. 152, etc.

ἀντί, in return for.

8. **τοὺς οἰκέτας**: *τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα infra*; cp. c. 41 *supra.*

ἐκείνῃ: sc. *ἐν τῷ Ἀταρνέι*, Stein; or possibly *ἐν Σάρδισι.*

ὑποδεξάμενον ἄσμενον: this construction is paralleled in Thuc. 6. 12. 2 *ἄρχειν ἄσμενος αἱρεθείς. ἄσμενος* is a curious adjective, itself at times almost participially constructed; cp. c. 14 *supra.*

10. **πανοικίῃ**: 7. 39 *supra.*

περιέλαβε: cp. *περιῆλθε ad fin.*

11. **ἤδη**: as in c. 105 *supra.*

12. **ἔργων** is here (and there) used perhaps of industrial 'works' (*ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι*). The formula *τῶν ἡμ. ἴδ.* would be very dull here! Cp. c. 105 *supra.*

τὸν βίον κτησάμενε: a variant on *τὴν ζόην κατεστήσατο* c. 105.

τί σε ἐγώ κτλ.: a *vendetta* might have justified the cruelty of Panionios to Hermotimos—as it now justifies that of Hermotimos to Panionios.

14. **ὅτι με ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς ἐποίησας τὸ μηδὲν εἶναι**, 'that thou hast made me to be, instead of a man, the merest cipher.' *τὸ μηδέν*, cp. 9. 58 *infra οὐδένες ἄρα ἐόντες κτλ.* and 1. 32 *ἡ δ' ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονίη οὕτω τοι ἀπέρριπται ἐς τὸ μηδέν* . ., neither of which passages is so forcible as this. Contr. Plato *Laws* 716 B *πολλοῖς τισὶν ἔδοξεν εἶναί τις.*

ἐδόκεές τε θεοὺς λήσειν οἷα ἐμηχανῶ τότε, 'thou wast thinking to

τε θεοὺς λήσειν οἷα ἐμηχανῶ τότε· οἵ σε ποιήσαντα ἀνόσια, νόμῳ δικαίῳ χρεώμενοι, ὑπήγαγον ἐς χεῖρας τὰς ἐμάς, ὥστε σε μὴ μέμψασθαι τὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμέο τοι ἐσομένην δίκην." ὡς δέ οἱ ταῦτα ὠνείδισε, ἀχθέντων τῶν παίδων ἐς ὄψιν ἠναγκάζετο ὁ Πανιώνιος τῶν ἑωυτοῦ παίδων τεσσέρων ἐόντων τὰ αἰδοῖα ἀποτάμνειν, ἀναγκαζόμενος δὲ ἐποίεε ταῦτα· αὐτοῦ τε, ὡς ταῦτα ἐργάσατο, οἱ παῖδες ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀπέταμνον. Πανιώνιον μέν νυν οὕτω περιῆλθε ἥ τε τίσις καὶ Ἑρμότιμος.

Ξέρξης δὲ ὡς τοὺς παῖδας ἐπέτρεψε Ἀρτεμισίῃ ἀπάγειν **107** *ἐς Ἔφεσον, καλέσας Μαρδόνιον ἐκέλευσέ μιν τῆς στρατιῆς διαλέγειν τοὺς βούλεται, καὶ ποιέειν τοῖσι λόγοισι τὰ ἔργα πειρώμενον ὅμοια. ταύτην μὲν τὴν ἡμέρην ἐς τοσοῦτο ἐγίνετο, τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς κελεύσαντος βασιλέος τὰς νέας οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐκ*

15 *οἵ δέ σε?* Stein[2] 16 *χρεόμενοι* P, van H. ‖ *ἐς* om. **B** ‖ *χέρας* CPz 17 *μέμψεσθαι* Cobet, van H. ‖ *τοι*: *του* **B** 18 *ὠνείδιζε* CPz 19 *παιώνιος* **B** ‖ *τεσσάρων* C 20 *ὡς*: *ὃς* P[1] 21 *παιώνιον* **B** 22 *τε* om. **B** ‖ *ὁ Ἑρμότιμος* CPz, van H. **107.** 1 *ἀρτεμισίῃ ἐπέτρεψε* CPz 2 *ἐκέλευέ* **B**, Holder 3 *τοὺς ἂν βούληται* z 4 *πειρώμενον* secl. Krueger ‖ *ὁμοῖα* CPz, van H. ‖ *τοσοῦτον* **B**z 5 *βασιλῆος* z ‖ *νῆας* **B**z

escape the eyes of God in such deeds as thou wast then contriving.'

16. **νόμῳ δικαίῳ χρεώμενοι**: the Divine justice to Hdt. is strictly anthropomorphic. Cp. Introduction, § 11.

ὥστε σε μὴ μέμψασθαι, ferocious irony: 'so that you (should) find no fault with . .,' 'so that you (should) have no fault to find with.' Not merely, 'so that you have no right to complain that I revenge myself on you!' Cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 6. 2. 34 *εἰ δέ τις μὴ ἀκολουθήσει, προεῖπε μὴ μέμψεσθαι τὴν δίκην*: Plato *Laws* 716 B *ὑποσχὼν τιμωρίαν οὐ μεμπτὴν τῇ δίκῃ ἑαυτόν τε καὶ οἶκον καὶ πόλιν ἄρδην ἀνάστατον ἐποίησε.* The aorist infinitive with the future participle is piquant.

20. **ἀναγκαζόμενος**, passive: no doubt by torture.

22. **περιῆλθε ἥ τε τίσις καὶ Ἑρμότιμος**: is it possible that Hdt. should have meant to spoil his grim story with a pun? Yet be *τίσις* never so much personified the phrase seems not quite happy. Cp. 3. 4 *σοφίῃ γάρ μιν περιῆλθε ὁ Φάνης.* L. & S. render the word here 'came at last upon . .' (*περιέλαβε* up above seems the complement), and in c. 6 *supra* 'surround,' *in potestatem habuit* (Baehr). Perhaps the explanation should be sought not so much in a *zeugma* (*περιῆλθε*) as in a *hendiadys* (*ἥ τε τίσις καὶ Ἑρμότιμος*), 'Vengeance in the person of Hermotimos laid hands on Panionios.'

107. 1. **Ξέρξης δέ**: the narrative resumed from c. 103 *supra*; the story of Hermotimos, though a digression, is hardly an insertion: it will have belonged to the earliest deposits in Hdt.'s memory and knowledge.

3. **διαλέγειν**, *secernere*, to divide the 'sheep and the goats'; cp. c. 113 *infra* *τοῖσι εἴδεα ὑπῆρχε διαλέγων.*

ποιέειν τοῖσι λόγοισι τὰ ἔργα πειρώμενον ὅμοια: *πειρώμενον*, a limitation; *si fieri posset*, Stein. Or, 'so far as in him lay.'

4. **ταύτην μὲν τὴν ἡμέρην.** Is this merely a conventional turn, or does Hdt. use it with conscious design? No change of day has been noticed since the dawn in c. 83 *supra.* On that showing, the day here is the day of battle, and the night is the night of that very day. There seems no reason to doubt this result, though it suggests that the battle was over long before nightfall (perhaps before noon?)

ἐς τοσοῦτο ἐγίνετο: things went no further; *ἐγίνετο*, impers. as in c. 6 *supra.*

5. **οἱ στρατηγοί**, the admirals; cp. c. 75 *supra.*

τοῦ Φαλήρου ἀπῆγον ὀπίσω ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ὡς τάχεος εἶχε ἕκαστος, διαφυλαξούσας τὰς σχεδίας πορευθῆναι βασιλέι. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀγχοῦ ἦσαν Ζωστῆρος πλέοντες οἱ βάρβαροι, ἀνατείνουσι γὰρ ἄκραι λεπταὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ταύτης, ἔδοξάν τε νέας εἶναι καὶ ἔφευγον ἐπὶ πολλόν· χρόνῳ δὲ μαθόντες ὅτι οὐ νέες εἶεν ἀλλ' ἄκραι, συλλεχθέντες ἐκομίζοντο.

108 *Ὡς δὲ ἡμέρη ἐγίνετο, ὁρῶντες οἱ Ἕλληνες κατὰ χώρην*

6 ταχέως Sz 7 ἔσχεν **B** || φυλαξούσας **B** || βασιλῆα z : βασιλεῖ 8 ἔσαν z || πλώοντες **B**Pz 9 τῆς ἠπείρου, ταύτας **B** : 'An τῆς ἠπείρου ταύτῃ?' Kallenberg : 'An ταύτης, ταύτας?' van H. || νῆας **B**z 10 νέες C : νῆες **108.** 1 ἐγένετο CPz || ὁρέωντες C : ὁρέοντες **B**, Stein[1], van H.

ἐκ τοῦ Φαλήρου . . ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον: from out the bay of Phaleron into the Hellespont—from which they had come (ὀπίσω). Did they go direct, or all round by the route they had come by? They apparently reached the Hellespont, cp. c. 117 *infra.*

6. **ὡς τάχεος εἶχε ἕκαστος**, 'each one as fast as he could . .' The picture presented is of a shattered fleet streaming across the sea in a *sauve qui peut* style.

7. **διαφυλαξούσας . . βασιλέι**, "infinitivum πορευθῆναι nescio quid durius habere videtur," Baehr. διαφ. βασ. ὥστε αὐτὸν πορευθῆναι, Schweighaeuser. Perhaps πορευθῆναι is rather an exegetical, or even a telic infinitive after διαφυλαξούσας, and βασιλέι a purely ethical dative (so B.). Stein cps. 4. 64 χλαίνας ἐπείνυσθαι ποιεῦσι, and καταβάλλειν 7. 25 *supra* (a less exact parallel).

8. **Ζωστῆρος.** Strabo 398 describes it as a large promontory, next the deme of Aixone. It is certainly identified with the three-headed promontory, near the modern *Vari.* Pausanias 1. 31. 1 mentions that there was an altar there Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ Λητοῦς, and explains the name: τεκεῖν μὲν οὖν Λητὼ τοὺς παῖδας ἐνταῦθα οὔ φασι, λύσασθαι δὲ τὸν ζωστῆρα ὡς τεξομένην, καὶ τῷ χωρίῳ διὰ τοῦτο γενέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα. The promontory might perhaps be considered like a ζωστήρ in appearance.

9. **ἄκραι λεπταὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ταύτης**: is ταύτης merely graphic = ταύτῃ, or is Hdt. writing as in Europe? Stein cps. 7. 201, which does not settle the point.

Zoster itself is a large promontory; but its three headlands may be referred to as ἄκραι λεπταί. Rawlinson, however, remarks that "it is not very likely they could have been mistaken by the Persians (*sic*) for ships." Theophrastus *Charact.* 25 has ὁ δειλὸς τοιοῦτός τις οἷος πλέων τὰς ἄκρας φάσκειν ἡμιολίας εἶναι.

10. **ἐπὶ πολλόν**, of space, as in 2. 32, not of time, as in 2. 119.

11. **συλλεχθέντες**: passive in form, middle in force. **ἐκομίζοντο**, 'they continued their voyage'; cp. ἐκομίζετο c. 118 *infra.*

108. 1. **ἡμέρη**: apparently the day after the battle. Hdt. has spent the night on the Persian side (cc. 97–107). The Greeks had retired into the bay of Salamis again (c. 96 *supra*), quite ignorant of the magnitude of their success, and expecting to have the struggle renewed (as at Artemision) upon the following day. The illusion was not dissipated at once even with the return of the sun: the Persian army was still visible on the Attic shore, and the sight created a presumption that the fleet was not far off. If so, the presumption was ill-founded: the army might have remained in order to cover the retreat of the ships. It seems unlikely that news of the flight of the king's vessels had not reached the Greeks; but it would have been quite impossible for the Greeks to leave Salamis, while the king's land-forces were in occupation of Attica, even if no visible threat of an assault upon Salamis (cp. c. 97 *supra*) was in being. Hdt. has hardly envisaged or grasped the strategic situation in this case.

οἱ Ἕλληνες: the Greeks at large, but more particularly the commanders.

κατὰ χώρην μένοντα τ. στ. τ. πεζόν: the same army as was marching, on the night before the battle, to the attack of Peloponnesos, c. 70 *supra.* It is, of course, possible for us, with two or three

μένοντα τὸν στρατὸν τὸν πεζὸν ἤλπιζον καὶ τὰς νέας εἶναι περὶ Φάληρον, ἐδόκεόν τε ναυμαχήσειν σφέας παραρτέοντό τε ὡς ἀλεξησόμενοι. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπύθοντο τὰς νέας οἰχωκυίας, αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα ἐδόκεε ἐπιδιώκειν. τὸν μέν νυν ναυτικὸν τὸν Ξέρξεω στρατὸν οὐκ ἐπεῖδον διώξαντες μέχρι Ἄνδρου, ἐς δὲ τὴν Ἄνδρον ἀπικόμενοι ἐβουλεύοντο. Θεμιστοκλέης μέν νυν

2 νῆας **B**z 4 ἐπείτε? van H. || δ' **B** || νῆας **B**z || ὠχωκυία R: ὠχωκυίας SV 5 τὸν μὲν στρατὸν τὸν ξέρξεω R: τὸν μὲν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν τὸν ξέρξεω SV

columns of Persian infantry and cavalry at our disposal, to harmonize the discrepancy; but it remains a discrepancy on Hdt.'s own showing.

2. **εἶναι περὶ Φάληρον**: whither the survivors had retired on the previous day; c. 93 *supra*. Ships at Phaleron, or in the bay, would be invisible to the Greeks at Salamis: a matter of conjecture or speculation (**ἤλπιζον**).

3. **παραρτέοντο**: cp. c. 81 *supra*.

4. **ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπύθοντο**: Hdt. fails to specify the exact time, at which, or the means by which, the Greeks were informed of the flight of the king's fleet. If they no sooner learned it than they resolved to pursue (**αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα**), we might infer that they only learnt the retreat of the fleet after the evacuation of Athens and Attica by the army. But, if the fleet evacuated Phaleron immediately after the battle, it had a long start of the Greeks, who, whatever they might desire or decide to do, could not leave Salamis unprotected, until they were assured that the Persian army too was in full retreat. Was the pursuit of the Persian fleet seriously intended? It would certainly not have been lightly undertaken, or without ardent debate. Hdt. records just below a debate at Andros; but the Hellenes can hardly have rowed to Andros, whatever the object of that movement, without a previous council and discussion. Hdt. has assuredly omitted to report a debate at Salamis, after the victory.

6. **μέχρι Ἄνδρου.** The island of Andros, one of the 'Kyklades' (cp. 5. 31), lies between Euboia and Tenos (cp. 4. 33), and is about 80 E. miles voyage from Salamis. It had evidently 'medized,' cp. c. 66 *supra*, and has special reasons for medizing; cp. 7. 115 *supra*.

7. **ἐβουλεύοντο**: the scene, the speakers, the subject, of this council, or debate, are all open to challenge. For reasons above given the Greek fleet can hardly have quitted Salamis in pursuit of 'the flying Mede': if the Greeks put into Andros, which was a Persian outpost or stronghold, it must have been with the intention of 'liberating' or gaining the island for the good cause; the attack on Andros, and the medizing islands, will have been resolved upon before the Greeks left Salamis. Hdt. treats this operation as a matter of course, or as the obvious alternative to a pursuit of the 'barbarian' fleet (c. 111 *infra*); but it will have required an express decision, even if covered by the general vow against the medizers (7. 132). Again, Eurybiades here appears as taking part in the debate, and as the opponent of Themistokles; dramatic, and perhaps constitutional proprieties are better observed above in the accounts of the debates before Salamis, where Korinthian opposes Athenian, or in the variant on this very anecdote, which pits Aristeides against Themistokles (cp. Appendix VII. § 2). The Spartan has perhaps come in as the exponent of the characteristically Lakonian policy, not to pursue a flying foe. The plan ascribed to Themistokles is here expressed in almost self-contradictory terms, or as combining incompatible objects: *διὰ νήσων τραπέσθαι· ἐπιδιῶξαι τὰς νέας· πλέειν ἰθέως ἐπὶ τ. Ἑλλ.* λύσοντας τὰς γεφύρας (i.e. *ἐπὶ τ. Ἑλλ. πλεύσαντας* λῦσαι *τ. γ.*). The first phrase may be ambiguous, covering alike operations against the islands (the Kyklades) in succession, and a passage through them without touching; but the ideas of pursuing the Persian fleet and of sailing for the Hellespont to destroy the bridges could only be harmonized on the assumption that the Persian fleet had made for the Hellespont; and even so, the pursuit of the

γνώμην ἀπεδείκνυτο διὰ νήσων τραπομένους καὶ ἐπιδιώξαντας τὰς νέας πλέειν ἰθέως ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον λύσοντας τὰς γεφύρας· Εὐρυβιάδης δὲ τὴν ἐναντίην ταύτῃ γνώμην ἐτίθετο, λέγων ὡς εἰ λύσουσι τὰς σχεδίας, τοῦτ' ἂν μέγιστον πάντων σφι κακῶν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐργάσαιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἀναγκασθείη ἀπολαμφθεὶς ὁ Πέρσης μένειν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ, πειρῷτο ἂν ἡσυχίην μὴ ἄγειν, ὡς ἄγοντι μέν οἱ ἡσυχίην οὔτε τι προχωρέειν οἷόν τε ἔσται τῶν πρηγμάτων οὔτε τις κομιδὴ τὸ ὀπίσω φανήσεται, λιμῷ τέ οἱ ἡ στρατιὴ διαφθερέεται, ἐπιχειρέοντι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἔργου ἐχομένῳ πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην οἷά τε ἔσται προσχωρῆσαι κατὰ πόλις τε καὶ κατὰ

---

8 ἐπεδείκνυτο **B** 9 νῆας **B**z || πλώειν **B**z 12 σφέας **B**: σφεῖς z || κακὸν **B** || ἐργάσατο R: ἐργάσαιντο SV: ἐργασαίατο Dindorf, Cobet, Kallenberg, van H. 13 ἐν τῇ εὐρώπῃ μένειν **B**: ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ huc ex fine cap. translata susp. Kallenberg || πειρῷτ' ABz 15 <ἐς> τὸ Cobet (quod olim impugn. Schweighaeuser) 16 φανέεται ? Krueger || διαφθαρέεται **a**: διαφθαρεῖται van H. || ἐπιχωρέοντι **B**

---

fleet might involve a second engagement, which might prove an obstacle to destroying the bridges. Possibly all three ideas (i. the destruction of the bridges; ii. the pursuit of the flying Phoenicians; iii. the visitation of the medizing islands) were traditionally and rightly associated with Themistokles; but they should not have been given to him in one breath!

10. **γνώμην ἐτίθετο**: a variant upon the more common *γν. ἀπεδείκνυτο* (cp. just above), perhaps used here out of regard to the commanding position of Eurybiades; or perhaps simply from the analogy of voting, as in c. 123 *infra* *ἐτίθετο τὴν ψῆφον*. The opinion ascribed to Eurybiades that the destruction of the bridges would be a national calamity for Greece is doubly refuted, (i.) by the apprehension previously ascribed to Xerxes (in a different anecdote) c. 97 *supra*; (ii.) by the logic of facts, the bridges having been destroyed without injury to Greece; cp. c. 117 *infra*.

11. **τοῦτ' ἂν . . ἐργάσαιτο**: as *ἐργάσαιτο* can scarcely be passive, the construction is with a double acc. after the verb (c. 79 *supra*), of which **τοῦτο** is subject, **σφι** being, of course, ethical dative. Cp. App. Crit.

14. **ἡσυχίην μὴ ἄγειν**: a curious equivalent for *ἐπιχειρέειν*, or *ἔργου ἔχεσθαι* (phrases used below), perhaps suggested by the speaker's desire that the Persian should *ἡσυχίην ἄγειν* (Stein). The argument which follows (**ὡς ἄγοντι μέν οἱ κτλ.**) seems far-fetched: the destruction of the bridges is to compel the Persian to the conquest of Europe; the victory at Salamis and the consequent superiority of the Greeks at sea are ignored. The whole passage reads like an estimate of the necessity for active and offensive measures on the invader's part before the invasion, or at least before his defeat, a necessity which was not conditioned simply by the existence or non-existence of the bridges; cp. Appendix IV. § 1.

15. **τῶν πρηγμάτων**, 'his plans.' **προχωρέειν**, 'to succeed': *προσχωρῆσαι* just below comes in rather inelegantly.

κομιδὴ τὰ ὀπίσω: cp. *ἡ κομιδὴ ἡμῖν ἔσται τὸ ὀπίσω* 4. 134, and *ἡ ὀπίσω κομιδή* c. 120 *infra*. *κ.* in a different sense 9. 73 *infra*.

18. **οἷά τε ἔσται προσχωρῆσαι.** The subject appears to be **πάντα τὰ κ. τ. Εὐρώπην**, 'all the parts of Europe,' i.e. all Europe; but the speaker is perhaps to be taken only to refer to the Hellenized portions, though *ἔθνεα* may cover non-Hellenic tribes (cp. 7. 1, 110 *supra*), and 'Europe' is again and again suggested as the ultimate Persian objective. The harvests of Hellas would hardly suffice for the universal conquest of all Europe.

ἔθνεα, ἤτοι ἁλισκομένων γε ἢ πρὸ τούτου ὁμολογεόντων·
τροφήν τε ἕξειν σφέας τὸν ἐπέτειον αἰεὶ τὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων
καρπόν. ἀλλὰ δοκέειν γὰρ νικηθέντα τῇ ναυμαχίῃ οὐ μενέειν
ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ τὸν Πέρσην· ἐατέον ὦν εἶναι φεύγειν, ἐς ὃ
ἔλθοι φεύγων ἐς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ· τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου
ποιέεσθαι ἤδη τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐκέλευε. ταύτης δὲ εἴχοντο τῆς
γνώμης καὶ Πελοποννησίων τῶν ἄλλων οἱ στρατηγοί. ὡς δὲ **109**
ἔμαθε ὅτι οὐ πείσει τούς γε πολλοὺς πλέειν ἐς τὸν Ἑλλή-
σποντον ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης, μεταβαλὼν πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους

20 *τὸν* ante *τῶν* om. **B**, Holder 21 *ἀλλ' οὐ δοκεῖν* C || *οὐ μενέειν* : *μένειν* C 22 *πέρσεα* **B** : *Περσέα* z 23 *ἔλθῃ* **B** : *ἔλθῃ* Stein[1], Holder 24 *ἐκέλευε* del. Cobet, van H. **109.** 2 *πλώειν* **B**z 3 *ἔλεγε πρὸς* **B**

19. **ἢ πρὸ τούτου ὁμολογεόντων**: grammatically the less likely looks politically the more likely alternative; viz. that they should come to an agreement before being taken, or reduced by force. The (masculine) gen. abs. is noticeable. With the phraseology of this passage cp. 7. 139 *supra*.

20. **τὸν ἐπέτειον αἰεὶ τὸν τ. Ἑλ. καρπόν.** The article as in *τὸν ναυτικὸν τὸν Ξέρξεω στρατόν* 1. 5 *supra*. Unless *αἰεί* might have practically a locative sense the phrase seems to imply a series of annual campaigns, though *ἐπέτειος* might not perhaps in itself necessitate a succession of harvests; cp. 2. 25 *δοκέει δέ μοι οὐδὲ πᾶν τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἐπέτειον ἑκάστοτε ἀποπέμπεσθαι τοῦ Νείλου ὁ ἥλιος κτλ.*, 2. 92 *τὴν δὲ βύβλον τὴν ἐπέτειον γινομένην ἐπεὰν ἀνασπάσωσι κτλ.*

21. **ἀλλὰ δοκέειν γὰρ νικηθέντα κτλ.** Eurybiades the Spartan is represented as saying—and so say all of the Peloponnesian commanders—that the Persians would not remain in Europe after the defeat at Salamis. This prognostication is abundantly nullified, not merely by the commission of Mardonios, but even after Plataia by the remnant in Thrace, cp. 7. 106, 107 *supra*. It is, however, possible that the formula represents accurately enough the Spartan and 'Peloponnesian' point of view, or hope: the more plausible, if the Greeks had already witnessed the evacuation of Attica by the land-forces of the barbarian. Even when later the Spartans must have been convinced that the Persian had not abandoned Europe, or even Hellas, in spite of his defeat at Salamis, they were still hoping to avoid any necessity for another land-engagement; cp. Appendix VII. § 1.

23. **περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ποιέεσθαι ἤδη τὸν ἀγῶνα**: remarkable is the idea of an aggressive movement upon the king's possessions thus formulated on the lips of Eurybiades. Is it an anachronism, borrowed from the *πρόσχημα* of the Delian League in 477 B.C. (cp. Thuc. 1. 96)? Or is it but an anticipation of the naval programme of Mykale and Sestos, in the next year (479 B.C.)? Or is it not rather a testimony to the first and fundamental principles of Themistoklean strategy, which had already, and even before Salamis, advocated an offensive movement as the best means of relieving the tension in Greece? After all, 'the march to Sardis' was an old idea, nay, a *fait accompli*, in Athenian quarters; cp. 5. 97 ff.; but that a Spartan in 480 B.C. contemplates a struggle for the possession of the king's own territory (*περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου*, causal not locative) is a little surprising.

24. **εἴχοντο** with the gen., 'laid hold of,' 'adhered to'; cp. (with *γνώμης*) Thuc. 1. 140. 1, and 6. 94 *supra ταύτης ἐχόμενος τῆς προφάσιος*.

109. 2. **οὐ πείσει τούς γε πολλούς.** Hdt. here writes as though the movements of the fleet were determined by a majority of votes; no doubt the Navarch, Eurybiades, really had the actual decision; cp. c. 64 *supra*.

3. **μεταβαλών**: cp. 5. 75 *Κορίνθιοι . . μετέβαλλόν τε καὶ ἀπαλλάσσοντο.* In that passage, as in 7. 52 *supra*, the word appears to be used, intransitively, of actual physical change of place; and here the words *πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους*

(οὗτοι γὰρ μάλιστα ἐκπεφευγότων περιημέκτεον, ὁρμέατό τε ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον πλέειν καὶ ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτῶν βαλόμενοι, εἰ οἱ ἄλλοι μὴ βουλοίατο) ἔλεγέ σφι τάδε. "καὶ αὐτὸς ἤδη πολλοῖσι παρεγενόμην καὶ πολλῷ πλέω ἀκήκοα τοιάδε γενέσθαι, ἄνδρας ἐς ἀναγκαίην ἀπειληθέντας [νενικημένους] ἀναμάχεσθαί τε καὶ ἀναλαμβάνειν τὴν προτέρην κακότητα. ἡμεῖς δέ, εὕρημα γὰρ εὑρήκαμεν ἡμέας τε αὐτοὺς καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, νέφος τοσοῦτο ἀνθρώπων ἀνωσάμενοι, μὴ διώκωμεν

---

4 *ὡρμέατό* **a** etc. 5 *πλώειν* **B**z || *αὐτέων* z || *βαλλόμενοι* z : *βουλόμενοι* **B** 6 *εἰ ὤλλοι* **B** 7 *πλείω* **B** 8 *νενικημένους* Stein : del. Cobet, Holder, van H. 11 *τοσοῦτον* A ante ras. **B**z || *ἀνθρώπων* damn. Dobree || *ἀνωσάμενοι* **B**Pz : *ἀνασωσάμενοι*

---

support a similar interpretation—otherwise a mental conversion might be preferable. *Mutato consilio ad Athenienses se convertens* (Schweigh. Lex.) seems unwarrantably to combine both.

4. **περιημέκτεον** : an Herodotean word, used with the dative, as in 4. 154, and absolutely, as in 1. 114 *μᾶλλόν τι περιημέκτεε*, is here used with a sort of causal genitive (*ἐκπεφευγότων*). The meaning is clear ('were aggrieved'), but the etymology unknown.

ὁρμέατο : the pluperfect passive, without augment. The tense might here have its temporal meaning, even in view of the sequence *εἰ οἱ ἄλλοι μὴ βουλοίατο*. The condition predicated is, of course, purely psychological.

5. **ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτῶν βαλόμενοι**, 'at their own risk'? 'on their own responsibility'? or 'by themselves'? cp. 5. 73 and 3. 71. The exact metaphor is less clear than the meaning; the expression is apparently Herodotean. **καί**, *etiam*.

6. **ἔλεγέ σφι τάδε.** Hdt. does not shrink from reporting the speeches of Themistokles; cp. cc. 60, 61 f., 80, 83 *supra*.

7. **πολλοῖσι παρεγενόμην** : *πολλοῖσι* is presumably neuter, as co-ordinate with *πολλῷ πλέω* just below. The occasions referred to, if set out, would have furnished an interesting chapter of autobiography. The emphatic co-ordination **καὶ . . καί** is observable.

8. **ἀπειληθέντας** [**νενικημένους**] : the doubled participles are clumsy though intelligible; cp. App. Crit. At Andros (*Mannheim*, Pape-Benseler) the Greeks have to do with *ἄνδρες*. Themistokles does not despise the enemy.

9. **ἀναμάχεσθαί τε καὶ ἀναλαμβάνειν** : cp. 5. 121 *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ τρῶμα ἀνέλαβόν τε καὶ ἀνεμαχέσαντο οἱ Κᾶρες*. (Themistokles can hardly have been present on that occasion.) *ἀναλαμβάνειν* having an object here (**κακότητα**) is of simpler construction, and perhaps of more obvious meaning, cp. 7. 232 *supra*, but *κακότης* itself is of disputable significance. In 2. 128 it appears to mean 'evil plight,' misery; and it may bear the same meaning in 2. 124; so too, most clearly, in 6. 67, where it is opposed to *εὐδαιμονίῃ*, but in 7. 168 *supra* it certainly denotes a defect of character, cowardice or what not (cp. Thuc. 5. 100 *κακότης καὶ δειλία*), and it might bear that interpretation here.

10. **εὕρημα γὰρ εὑρήκαμεν**, 'we have had a stroke of luck,' cp. 7. 10 l. 43; the cognate acc. is simple enough, but the addition of the further accusatives, **ἡμέας τε αὐτοὺς καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα**, complicates the sentence, and without the addition of a participle, co-ordinate with *ἀνωσάμενοι*, a *constructio ad sensum* is a trifle violent—as though *εὕρ. εὑρήκ.* might form a single verbal idea and construction = *ἀναλελαβήκαμεν* (sc. *ἀνειλήφαμεν*). *ἡμέας τε αὐτοὺς καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα* may, however, be taken in apposition to *εὕρημα*—a somewhat excited phrase! Anything were better than inserting *ἀνασωσάμενοι*. Cp. App. Crit.

11. **νέφος τοσοῦτο ἀνθρώπων ἀνωσάμενοι** : the metaphor is superb; the barbarians are mere *ἄνθρωποι* from this point of view (though *ἄνδρες φεύγοντες* immediately below). The verb is curious—cp. App. Crit.—but justified by 7. 139, a passage perhaps influenced by the oratory of Themistokles.

ἄνδρας φεύγοντας. τάδε γὰρ οὐκ ἡμεῖς κατεργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ θεοί τε καὶ ἥρωες, οἳ ἐφθόνησαν ἄνδρα ἕνα τῆς τε Ἀσίης καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης βασιλεῦσαι ἐόντα ἀνόσιόν τε καὶ ἀτάσθαλον· ὃς τά τε ἱρὰ καὶ τὰ ἴδια ἐν ὁμοίῳ ἐποιέετο, ἐμπιπράς τε καὶ καταβάλλων τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα· ὃς καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν

---

15 *τε* ante *ἱρὰ* om. **β**P*z* || *ἐμπιπρείς* **α** : *ἐμπιπρήσας* C

---

12. **τάδε,** of antecedents ; cp. the occasional use of *ταῦτα* for consequents ; *ὅδε* and *οὗτος* both contrast with *ἐκεῖνος*, as the nearer with the more remote ; and with each other, as the immediate present (or just coming) with the mediate present (or just gone).

13. **θεοί τε καὶ ἥρωες,** 'Gods and Heroes combined.' The passage refutes incidentally the sneer of Mardonios against the Greeks as *τῶν τὸ πᾶν σφίσι ἤδη δοκεόντων κατεργάσθαι* c. 100 *supra* (spoken of course with quite another 'intention'), for at least it disclaims the victory as their own work : even Themistokles, however, appears in the context as overrating the effects of the battle of Salamis (*παντελέως ἀπελάσας τὸν βάρβαρον*).

οἳ ἐφθόνησαν . . βασιλεῦσαι : the doctrine of the divine *φθόνος* appears here upon the lips of Themistokles in its simplest form : the gods view with jealousy one man's lordship of Asia and Europe combined. Such an excess of human power is in itself a sufficient reason for the divine passion. The words which follow **ἐόντα ἀνόσιόν τε καὶ ἀτάσθαλον** may be taken, not as the justification of the ways of gods to man, but as a statement of pure matter of fact —a fact inevitable, since what mortal invested with such power could avoid pride, presumption, impiety, sin? In the examples which follow (*ὃς κτλ.*), if it were worth while to distinguish the *ἀνοσιότης* and the *ἀτασθαλίη*, the destruction of temples and cult-objects might illustrate the former, and the lashing and fettering of the sea the latter.

15. **ἐν ὁμοίῳ ἐποιέετο,** 'made no difference between . .' ; cp. 7. 138 *supra* (in a somewhat different sense).

ἐμπιπράς τε καὶ καταβάλλων : as at Abai c. 33 *supra*, and above all at Athens c. 53 *supra*. It is noticeable that there is no reference to the case of Delphi (cc. 35–39 *supra*) ; nor is anything said of the cases in which Xerxes had shown positive respect for Greek religion and cult-objects (e.g. at Troy 7. 43 *supra*, at Halos 7. 197 *supra*, at Athens itself c. 54 *supra*, and of course at Thebes, not to press the sacrifices at Nine Ways 7. 114, at Sepias 7. 191). Athenians naturally made the most of the point (cp. Aischyl. *Pers.* 805 f.), though their own record was not clean in this respect (cp. 5. 102) ; but it was left for Cicero to represent the Persians as Puritan fanatics, indignant with the Greeks for believing that the gods could be enclosed 'in temples made with hands' (*de legg.* 2. 10. 26 Xerxes inflammasse templa Graeciae dicitur, quod parietibus includerent deos, quibus omnia deberent esse patentia ac libera, quorumque hic mundus omnis templum esset et domus). That view is refuted by what is known of the policy of Dareios and his successors in Egypt, in Babylon, in Greece itself — to say nothing of the acts of Kyros and Kambyses. The invasion of Greece was in no sense a crusade or religious war, but the Greeks naturally enough invested their victory with a religious halo, and exaggerated the offences against the national religion committed by the Persians as incidents of the campaign. Hence the intensely religious tone of the Herodotean narrative, little as the great centres of the national religion did for Greece in her hour of need. Hence too the decree, or supposed decree, that the temples destroyed by the Persian should remain for ever in ruins (cp. the forged oath in Lycurgus *c. Leocrat.* 81, and Pausan. 10. 35. 2), a decree directly contravened by the earliest programme of Perikles (Plutarch, *Perikl.* 17) *inter alia*. But cp. c. 33 *supra*, 9. 116 *infra*.

16. **καὶ τὴν θ. ἀπεμαστίγωσε πέδας τε κατῆκε** : according to the story related in 7. 35 *supra*. Themistokles omits the stigmatization ! If this speech were authentic, and rightly dated to 480 B.C., it would be the earliest extant evidence for the incidents : items of Themistoklean oratory may be preserved in it, but hardly this particular sentence, which

ἀπεμαστίγωσε πέδας τε κατῆκε. ἀλλ' εὖ γὰρ ἔχει ἐς τὸ παρεὸν ἡμῖν, νῦν μὲν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καταμείναντας ἡμέων τε αὐτῶν ἐπιμεληθῆναι καὶ τῶν οἰκετέων, καί τις οἰκίην τε ἀναπλασάσθω καὶ σπόρου ἀνακῶς ἐχέτω, παντελέως ἀπελάσας

---

17 *τε κατῆκε*: *τ' ἐγκατῆκε* van H. 18 *μὲν* <*ἄμεινον*> Stein[3] (*χρεόν ἐστι?* Stein[2]) || *καταμείναντες* **β**z 19 *αὐτέων* **a**Cz || *ἐπιμεληθῶμεν* z 20 *ἀναπλασσάσθω* z, Eustath. Od. p. 1425 || *σπόρους* C: *σπορᾶς* Eustath. || *παντελέως* AB: *παντελῶς*

---

reads in any case rather forcedly. Perhaps the whole religious parenthesis (*τάδε γὰρ . . κατῆκε*) is Herodotean rather than authentic Themistokles. *ἀπομαστιγῶσαι*, 'to flog soundly,' occurs 3. 29.

17. **ἀλλ' εὖ γὰρ . . ἡμῖν**: cp. 7. 158 *ἀλλὰ* (*sic*) *εὖ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄμεινον κατέστη*, *Gelone loq.* (It can hardly be argued that the Sikeliote orator preserved while the Athenian avoided the *hiatus*: the variation exhibits the inconstancy of the MSS., perhaps of the author himself!)

18. **νῦν μὲν . . ἐπιμεληθῆναι.** Stein regards this construction as intolerably harsh, and emends the text (cp. App. Crit.); but surely the infinitive may stand as hortative (Madvig, *Gk. Syntax*, § 168), especially here when elucidated immediately in the very next sentence by the imperative *ἀναπλασάσθω* (cp. Aristoph. *Wsps.* 108), to say nothing of the jingle *ἄμεινον καταμείναντας*. The form of the verb *ἐπιμεληθῆναι*, like the subst. *ἐπιμέλεια* (6. 105), implies a present *ἐπιμελέομαι*—though the form of the present in use appears to have been *ἐπιμέλομαι*; cp. *ἐπιμέλεσθαι* 1. 98, *ἐπιμελομένῳ* 2. 2, *ἐπεμέλετο* 2. 174. (*μέλομαι*, I care for, take care of, with gen.; in the Tragedians *passim.*)

19. **οἰκετέων**: cp. c. 106 l. 8 *supra*.

20. **ἀναπλασάσθω.** *πλάσσειν* is used properly of soft materials, earth, wax, etc.

σπόρου ἀνακῶς ἐχέτω: cp. 1. 24 *ἀνακῶς δὲ ἔχειν τῶν πορθμέων.* Also Thuc. 8. 102. 2 *ὅπως αὐτῶν ἀνακῶς ἕξουσιν, ἢν ἐκπλέωσι.* The construction of *ἔχειν* with the adv. is, of course, regular enough, but the word *ἀνακῶς* itself is a curious one; cp. Plutarch, *Thes.* 33 *τιμὰς ἰσοθέους ἔσχον* (sc. *οἱ Τυνδαρίδαι*) *Ἄνακες προσαγορευθέντες, ἢ διὰ τὰς γενομένας ἀνοχὰς* (in Attica), *ἢ διὰ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ κηδεμονίαν τοῦ μηδένα κακῶς παθεῖν στρατιᾶς τοσαύτης ἔνδον οὔσης· ἀνακῶς γὰρ ἔχειν τοὺς ἐπιμελομένους ἢ φυλάττοντας ὁτιοῦν· καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἴσως ἄνακτας διὰ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ λέγοντες διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀστέρων ἐπιφάνειαν Ἄνακας ὀνομάζεσθαι· τὸ γὰρ ἄνω τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἀνέκας ὀνομάζειν καὶ ἀνέκαθεν τὸ ἄνωθεν.* The passage contains an exemplary bit of antique etymologizing, but L. & S. accept the connexion of *ἀνακῶς* with *ἄναξ*. The word was used by Plato, *Com. incert.* 24 (ed. Bothe-Didot) *καὶ τὰς* (or *τᾶς*) *θύρας ἀνακῶς ἔχειν*: cp. Erotianos p. 66, *Ἀνακῶς· ἐπιμελῶς καὶ περιπεφυλαγμενῶς. ἔστι δὲ ἡ λέξις Δωρική.* (Is it not rather 'old Attic,' and so appropriate in the mouth of Themistokles?)

παντελέως ἀπελάσας τὸν βάρβαρον. Themistokles appears to share the illusion (ascribed above to Eurybiades) that Salamis had put an end to the presence of the 'barbarian' in Greece. Stein, indeed, takes the sentence as conditional, and refers it not to the battle which has taken place, but to the land-engagement, which Themistokles expects to be fought before the winter (i.e. not "now that we have driven," but "as soon as we shall have driven the barbarian clean away"). This interpretation (i.) ill suits the context, especially the corresponding passage c. 108 *ad fin.*; (ii.) involves Themistokles in a huge misconception in regard to the probable action of the Peloponnesians; (iii.) makes him treat a great land-battle immediately to come as a foregone conclusion, to be mentioned *en passant*, sandwiched between the restoration of Athens and the expedition to the Hellespont; while (iv.) Hdt. himself declares the *rusé* character of Themistokles' advice to the Athenians; and although the purpose he assigns is unacceptable (see below), the possibility remains open that the argument of the speaker is a make-believe. In fact, the words, if

τὸν βάρβαρον· ἅμα δὲ τῷ ἔαρι καταπλέωμεν ἐπὶ Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ Ἰωνίης." ταῦτα ἔλεγε ἀποθήκην μέλλων ποιή-

21 ἐλλήσποντον C 22 ὑποθήκην z || ποιήσασθαι Bβ : ποιήσεσθαι

authentic, may have been used by Themistokles with his eyes open, and his participation in the Spartan illusion, that no land-battle would ever be necessary, may have been a voluntary hypothesis, *argumenti causa.* So, too, the promise to sail to the Hellespont and Ionia in the spring might at this point have been rather a concession to gain the Athenians, and to prevent the break-up of the fleet, than a deliberate plan, in view of the utter discomfiture of the Persian, or in anticipation of the subsequent policy of reprisals. It would, however, be a possible preventive of the re-invasion of Attica, in case the Persians had not evacuated Europe: as applicable in the spring as in the present autumn. The whole discussion (it must be remembered) can hardly have taken place until the Persians had evacuated Attica, and probably did not take place at Andros, but at Salamis. Whether Themistokles, when he realized that Mardonios was still in Greece with an army, failed to grasp the strategic aspects of the case, is a further question (cp. Appendix VII. § 1). It is at least arguable that the greatest of the Athenians never had any illusions upon the point.

22. **ταῦτα ἔλεγε ἀποθήκην μέλλων ποιήσασθαι.** This contribution to the Themistoklean legend represents him as a traitor from the beginning. The motivation is plainly an inference from the event (**τά περ ὦν καὶ ἐγένετο**), and is both psychologically and historically bad. There is an assumption involved that Themistokles did wrong in dissuading the Athenians from sailing off by themselves from Andros (or Salamis?) to the Hellespont, and his crime is the more flagrant seeing that he himself had advocated the move to the Hellespont just before. But Themistokles was neither inconsequent nor disloyal if he now wrought with the Athenians to prohibit a schismatic undertaking: rather might Hdt. have pronounced such an eulogy upon his act as Thucydides pronounced upon the act of Alkibiades in retaining the Athenian fleet at Samos in 411 B.C. from precipitately making for the city (cp. Thuc. 8. 82. 2). Strategically, the separate adventure of the Athenians must have been highly precarious; politically, it might have shattered the Alliance, which still had work to do: the reduction of the Kyklades by the confederate fleet was both strategically and politically the better investment. In so far as Hdt. (or his source) ascribes to Themistokles a prevision of possible disaster to himself in time to come, and sets him about making provision against a turn of Fortune's wheel, the bounds of psychological possibility are not passed, for a Greek and a Themistokles. Of such reverses, too, he could say: *καὶ αὐτὸς ἤδη πολλοῖσι παρεγενόμην καὶ πολλῷ πλέω ἀκήκοα τοιάδε γενέσθαι.* The trophies of Miltiades were before his eyes day and night. But there is no real relation between his reported advice on this occasion and his subsequent 'medism'—such as it was. The motivation here depends upon the truth of the story (in the next c.) of the second mission of Sikinnos—and that story is a transparent fraud. Grote, indeed, credits the view that Themistokles—"a clever man, tainted with such constant guilt"—calculated on being one day detected and punished; i.e. Grote takes the Themistokles-legend very much at its own estimation. Blakesley's note is curiously perverse, amounting to this: Thucydides is wrong in saying that Themistokles claimed credit in his letter to Artaxerxes (1. 137) for having saved the bridge for Xerxes, while Hdt. is right in saying that Themistokles, not knowing that the bridges were already broken down in 480 B.C. (if they were; cp. c. 117. 4 *infra*), intended, on some future occasion, should need arise, to claim credit with the king for saving the bridge!

ἀποθήκην . . ποιήσασθαι (= *ἀποθέσθαι*, or *ἀπόθετον ποιήσασθαι*) is scarcely adequate; cp. 6. 41 *χάριτα μεγάλην καταθήσεσθαι.* **ἐς** here looks like *apud.* **τὸν Πέρσην** generalized (for *Ξέρξην*) perhaps in the light of the event, Hdt., of course, knowing that Themistokles was received by Artaxerxes.

σασθαι ἐς τὸν Πέρσην, ἵνα ἤν ἄρα τί μιν καταλαμβάνῃ πρὸς Ἀθηναίων πάθος, ἔχῃ ἀποστροφήν· τά περ ὦν καὶ ἐγένετο.

110 Θεμιστοκλέης μὲν ταῦτα λέγων διέβαλλε, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐπείθοντο· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ καὶ πρότερον δεδογμένος εἶναι σοφὸς ἐφάνη ἐὼν ἀληθέως σοφός τε καὶ εὔβουλος, πάντως ἕτοιμοι ἦσαν λέγοντι πείθεσθαι. ὡς δὲ οὗτοί οἱ ἀνεγνωσμένοι ἦσαν, αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης ἄνδρας ἀπέπεμπε ἔχοντας πλοῖον, τοῖσι ἐπίστευε σιγᾶν ἐς πᾶσαν βάσανον ἀπικνεομένοισι

23 πέρσεα **B**z ‖ ἤν : εἰ C ‖ ἆρά τι AB 24 ἔχει **B** **110.** 1 ταῦτα μὲν z ‖ διέβαλε z 2 σοφός 'fortasse rectius abesset' van H. 3 ἑτοῖμοι CPz 4 ἔσαν z ‖ οὗτοι ἀνεγνωσμένη **B** ‖ ἔσαν z 5 ὁ om. **B** 6 ἐπίστευσε **B**, Holder : ἐπέστελλε z ‖ ἀπικομένοισι(ν V) **B**Pz

23. **ἄρα**, "in hypotheticals, to indicate the improbability of the supposition," L. & S. comparing Thuc. 1. 93. 7 *τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις παρῄνει* (sc. ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς) *ἤν ἄρα ποτὲ κατὰ γῆν βιασθῶσι, καταβάντας ἐς αὐτὸν ταῖς ναυσὶ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθίστασθαι.* The particle conveys perhaps a note of irony in the present passage, or perhaps a reference to the mind of Themistokles away from the author's. **πάθος** = *πάθημα*, as often.

24. **ἀποστροφήν**: in somewhat the same sense Thuc. 4. 76. 5 *οὔσης ἑκάστοις διὰ βραχέος ἀποστροφῆς* (*perfugium*). In a less literal sense, but more material, Hdt. 2. 13 *οὐ γὰρ δή σφι ἐστὶ ὕδατος οὐδεμία ἄλλη ἀποστροφὴ ὅτι μὴ ἐκ τοῦ Διὸς μοῦνον.*

110. 1. **διέβαλλε**: *decipiebat*, cp. 5. 50. "The expression shows how much prejudiced Herodotus is against Themistokles even in a case where not a shadow of suspicion falls on him," Stein. With the whole phrase cp. 5. 107 *Ἱστιαῖος μὲν λέγων ταῦτα διέβαλλε, Δαρεῖος δὲ ἐπείθετο.*

2. **σοφός**: the word in itself is not necessarily commendatory; cp. 5. 23 *ὦ βασιλεῦ, κοῖόν τι χρῆμα ἐποίησας, ἀνδρὶ Ἕλληνι δεινῷ τε καὶ σοφῷ δοὺς ἐγκτίσασθαι πόλιν ἐν Θρηίκῃ*; but **ἀληθέως σοφός τε καὶ εὔβουλος** is no faint praise, and admits that the advice of Themistokles to the Athenians was good, however questionable its motive. The contrast between **δεδογμένος εἶναι** and **ἐφάνη ἐών** is emphatic, but inappropriate; the word *δεδογμένος* is, however, a strong one, and weakens the grammatical or idiomatic antithesis. With the fact cp. c. 124 *infra ἐβώσθη τε καὶ ἐδοξώθη εἶναι ἀνὴρ πολλὸν Ἑλλήνων σοφώτατος*—a situation which looks almost like the antecedent of the *δεδογμένος* in this passage! Wilamowitz, *Herm.* xiv. 183, and Cobet, *Mnem.* xii. 279, refer to Themistokles the line, *σοφὸς μὲν ἀνὴρ τῆς δὲ χειρὸς οὐ κρατῶν* (Eupolis Δῆμοι? van H.).

4. **ἀνεγνωσμένοι ἦσαν**: this form of construction may be taken to give a really temporal pluperfect, so far as the participle is concerned. It is substantially identical with the construction c. 108 *supra ἐπύθοντο τὰς νέας οἰχωκυίας*, and in each case the words **αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα** (emphasizing the tense category) follow immediately. The Herodotean (or Ionic) use of *ἀναγιγνώσκειν* ('to convince,' 'persuade') is observable; cp. 7. 10, and *passim.*

6. **τοῖσι ἐπίστευε σιγᾶν.** Was Themistokles deceived in his confidential agents, from whose lips tortures were not to wring a confession? Was one of them, Sikinnos himself perhaps, the authority for this story? And who was to torture them—the king? the Athenians? To the king they were carrying the message; he had no need to torture them in order to learn it. The phrase looks as though some of the domestics of Themistokles had been put to the 'question' (say, in 471–70 B.C.) to prove his 'medism'; but whether anything like this anecdote was extracted from them is doubtful; the phrase might even suggest a negation. Themistokles was, indeed, himself the author of the fiction that Xerxes owed to him the preservation of the Hellespontine bridges (cp. Thuc. 1. 134). The letter of the exiled Athenian to Artaxerxes (in 465 B.C.?) is the earliest source to which the fiction can be traced: his enemies apparently improved the occasion, and elaborated the version preserved by Herodotus. Cp. Appendix VII. § 3.

τὰ αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο βασιλέι φράσαι· τῶν καὶ Σίκιννος ὁ οἰκέτης αὖτις ἐγένετο· οἳ ἐπείτε ἀπίκοντο πρὸς τὴν Ἀττικήν, οἳ μὲν κατέμενον ἐπὶ τῷ πλοίῳ, Σίκιννος δὲ ἀναβὰς παρὰ Ξέρξην ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἔπεμψέ με Θεμιστοκλέης ὁ Νεοκλέος, στρατηγὸς μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἀνὴρ δὲ τῶν συμμάχων πάντων ἄριστος καὶ σοφώτατος, φράσοντά τοι ὅτι Θεμιστοκλέης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, σοὶ βουλόμενος ὑπουργέειν, ἔσχε τοὺς Ἕλληνας τὰς νέας βουλομένους διώκειν καὶ τὰς ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ γεφύρας λύειν. καὶ νῦν κατ' ἡσυχίην πολλὴν κομίζεο." οἳ μὲν ταῦτα σημήναντες ἀπέπλεον ὀπίσω.

---

7 *τὰ αὐτὸς*: *τούτοισιν* **B** || *βασιλεῖ* AB || *σίκινος* R 8 *ἐπειδὴ* **B**Pz 9 *σίκυννος* C: *σίκινος* R 10 *ξέρξεα* **B**z 12 *ὅτι*: *ὁ* C || *ὁ Ἀθηναῖος* del. Kallenberg 13 *σοὶ*: *σὺ* C: om. **B** || *ὑποργέειν* **a** 14 *νῆας* **B**z 16 *ἀπέπλωον* **B**z

---

7. **τῶν καὶ Σίκιννος ὁ οἰκέτης αὖτις ἐγένετο**: the reference is to the former mission of Sikinnos reported c. 75 *supra*, which brought about the disastrous movement of the king's navy, and its consequent defeat. The statement (which reappears in Diodor. 11. 19 and Trogus *ap.* Justin. 2. 13) that the same messenger was a second time employed to approach Xerxes, or the Persians, refutes itself, and discredits the whole anecdote. Plutarch, *Them.* 16, and Polyainos 1. 30. 3 follow a more plausible source, which made Arnakes, a eunuch and prisoner, the messenger on this occasion. Blakesley remarks that in the time of Plutarch Themistokles apparently was believed to have purposely hastened the retreat of Xerxes by sending him word of the projected Greek move to the Hellespont, and probable destruction of the bridges. More recent critics have discovered in 'the popular'—or was it the rationalized?—view of the Plutarchian age the true key to the mystery; cp. Appendix VII. § 2.

8. **τὴν Ἀττικήν.** Hdt. of course assumes that Themistokles is in Andros (c. 108 *supra*), and Xerxes still in Athens; the absurdity of this assumption is noted c. 108 *supra*. Plutarch's story is again more plausible in laying the scene of the debate between Themistokles and Aristeides (*sic*) in Salamis.

10. **ἔλεγε τάδε.** The terms of the message are obviously exaggerated to exhibit the vanity of Themistokles, who iterates his own name and titles, and claims the prize not merely of 'wisdom' but of 'valour' among the Hellenes; the phrase **τῶν συμμάχων** could not have been used to the king in this connexion; there is no reference to the previous message, which now certainly called for explanation. But if any such message had been sent, it must have run very much in the terms *ὅτι Θεμιστοκλέης . . κομίζεο.*

13. **ὑπουργέειν**: cp. 7. 38, etc.

ἔσχε, 'held,' 'stayed'—aor., but why not present tense? Is it that Sikinnos is in Athens, Themistokles in Andros (*ex hypothesi*), and time has elapsed since the charge was entrusted to the speaker? Or is the past tense of the essence of the message, Themistokles wishing to suggest a doubt how long the action can be maintained? Or is the aorist used, 'without prejudice,' but from the speaker's point of view, as simply denoting a particular matter of fact? But this use would be more proper in a plain narrative than in an authentic message. Perhaps the message here simply preserves one of the charges against Themistokles afterwards formulated in the *γραφὴ προδοσίας*.

14. **διώκειν . . λύειν**: two different operations, which Themistokles could not assume to involve the same direction for the fleet; cp. c. 108 *supra*, and c. 111 *infra*.

15. **οἳ μὲν . . ὀπίσω.** Had Sikinnos been the messenger he would surely have been retained a prisoner; had Arnakes, he would have regained his position at court: in neither case would the messenger have returned; cp. c. 76 *supra*. On the former occasion Sikinnos had

111 *Οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες, ἐπείτε σφι ἀπέδοξε μήτ᾽ ἐπιδιώκειν ἔτι προσωτέρω τῶν βαρβάρων τὰς νέας μήτε πλέειν ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον λύσοντας τὸν πόρον, τὴν Ἄνδρον περικατέατο ἐξελεῖν ἐθέλοντες. πρῶτοι γὰρ Ἄνδριοι νησιωτέων αἰτηθέντες πρὸς Θεμιστοκλέος χρήματα οὐκ ἔδοσαν, ἀλλὰ προϊσχομένου Θεμιστοκλέος λόγον τόνδε, ὡς ἥκοιεν Ἀθηναῖοι περὶ ἑωυτοὺς ἔχοντες δύο θεοὺς μεγάλους, πειθώ τε καὶ ἀναγκαίην, οὕτω τέ σφι κάρτα δοτέα εἶναι χρήματα, ὑπεκρίναντο πρὸς ταῦτα λέγοντες ὡς κατὰ λόγον ἦσαν ἄρα αἱ Ἀθῆναι μεγάλαι τε καὶ*

---

111. 2 *προσωτέρωι* **α** || *νῆας* **B***z* || *μήτ᾽ ἐπιπλώειν* **B**: *μήτε πλώειν* *z* 3 *περιεκατέατο* CP*z* 4 *ἐξελέειν* **B** 5 *Θεμιστοκλέος . . προϊσχομένου* om. R || *χρήματα* ante *αἰτηθέντες* *z* 6 *τὸν λόγον* **B** 8 *ταῦτα* : *τάδε* **B** 9 *ἔσαν* *z* || *ἄρα* ante *ἦσαν* **B** || *αἱ* om. **B**, Holder

---

acted alone; the plurality of messengers here is no argument of the truth of this story. With **σημήναντες** cp. *σημήνας l.c.*

111. 1. ἀπέδοξε μήτ᾽: a double negative, the preposition *ἀπό* in composition having the force of a negation, *displicuit*; cp. *ἀπηγόρευε μή* c. 116 *infra*. The further pursuit of the 'barbarian' ships, and the voyage to the Hellespont, are here rightly treated as co-ordinate alternatives, not as identical actions.

3. **πόρον** here seems = *γεφύρας*, and not the waterway; cp. 7. 36. The object was not to free the passage, but to destroy the crossing.

τὴν Ἄνδρον περικατέατο: is this a maritime or a terrestrial operation? The Greeks were in complete command of the sea, but the actual investment of the city of Andros by land will be here included.

4. **πρῶτοι γάρ κτλ.**: the rationale is obviously at fault and malicious. The refusal of the Andrians to pay money to Themistokles would be no reason for their being invested by the confederate fleet or forces, unless, indeed, the money was for confederate purposes, a mulct perhaps inflicted on the Andrians for medism; and such is in fact the implication below, c. 112 (*ὡς πολιορκέοιτο διότι ἐμήδισε*). On the motives of Andrian policy in the Persian war cp. 7. 115. 6 *supra*.

5. **προϊσχομένου** is imperfect, or at least historical, and is followed by a double construction *in orat. obliq.*: (*a*) the conjunction with optative (*ὡς ἥκοιεν*), and (*b*) accusative with infinitive (*δοτέα εἶναι*). (**κάρτα**, by the way, would scarcely have occurred in Attic prose.)

6. **λόγον τόνδε**, 'a speech, as follows': another speech from Themistokles, in the nature of an apologue, to which the Andrians reply in the same vein. The personification, the apotheosis, of *Peitho* and *Ananke*, Suasion and Necessity, is less piquant or surprising than that of Poverty and Inability (*Penia*, *Amechania*), especially the latter, as a mere negation. The attitude of the Andrians might come as a fresh case in the experience of Themistokles that *ἄνδρας ἐς ἀναγκαίην ἀπειληθέντας ἀναμάχεσθαί τε καὶ ἀναλαμβάνειν τὴν προτέρην κακότητα*, c. 109 *supra*.

περὶ ἑωυτούς, 'about them,' 'in their train'; a well-known Atticism, cp. *οἱ περὶ τὸν Πείσανδρον πρέσβεις* Thuc. 8. 63. 3. Themistokles is made to speak as though the Athenians were acting independently and alone, a view refuted by the whole context; but perhaps the Andrian apologue was not really uttered on this occasion, in 480 B.C., when Athens was in ruins, but belongs to a later crisis; cp. the reply of the Andrians, below. In fact, the fable of Themistokles and the Andrians reads like a current apologue on the *ἀργυρολογία* of the Athenians among their allies.

9. **κατὰ λόγον ἦσαν ἄρα.** The reply of the Andrians is in any case ironical, but doubly so if uttered when Athens itself was in ruins, and Xerxes indeed, *ex hypothesi*, in possession of Attica. But if we may choose between this *mordax ironia* (Schweigh.) and a simple anachronism, let us discount the irony. *κατὰ λ.*, 'proportionately' (to Andros); the imperfect *ἦσαν* Baehr seems to think refers to the time before the war, and

εὐδαίμονες, καὶ θεῶν χρηστῶν ἥκοιεν εὖ· ἐπεὶ Ἀνδρίους γε εἶναι γεωπείνας ἐς τὰ μέγιστα ἀνήκοντας, καὶ θεοὺς δύο ἀχρήστους οὐκ ἐκλείπειν σφέων τὴν νῆσον ἀλλ' αἰεὶ φιλοχωρέειν, πενίην τε καὶ ἀμηχανίην, καὶ τούτων τῶν θεῶν ἐπηβόλους ἐόντας Ἀνδρίους οὐ δώσειν χρήματα· οὐδέκοτε γὰρ τῆς ἑωυτῶν ἀδυναμίης τὴν Ἀθηναίων δύναμιν εἶναι κρέσσω. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ὑποκρινάμενοι καὶ οὐ δόντες τὰ χρήματα ἐπολιορκέοντο. Θεμιστοκλέης δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἐπαύετο πλεονεκτέων, **112**

10 <*εἰ*> *καὶ* Stein[3]: <*αἴ*> *καὶ* Stein[2], Holder, van H. || *ἀνδρείους* C 11 *γεωπείνας* B[2]CPz: *γεοπεινίης* Krueger: *γεωπίνας* || *μάλιστα* PRz 12 *χρηστοὺς* **β** || *ἐλείπειν* A[1]B || *ἐμφιλοχωρέειν* Naber 13 *τουτέων* z 14 *ἐπηβούλους* C: *ἐπιβούλους* **β** || *γὰρ* <*ἂν*> Dobree, van H. 16 *τὰ χρήματα* **α**C: *χρήματα* **β** etc., Holder, van H.

translates *fuisse*; but it is purely idiomatic, cp. Stallbaum *ad* Plat. *Phaedr.* 35 cited by Baehr himself. Sitzler observes that the imperfect with *ἄρα* indicates that the speaker has just suddenly become aware of the truth of a proposition, previously ignored. A curious instance is afforded by 4. 64 *supra*: *δέρμα δὲ ἀνθρώπου καὶ παχὺ καὶ λαμπρὸν ἦν ἄρα.* The imperfect might then have stood in the *orat. recta.* In any case the *ἄρα* points the irony.

10. **θεῶν χρηστῶν ἥκοιεν εὖ**: the sequence *ἦσαν . . ἥκοιεν* was perhaps eased by the latter's being in a relative sentence (Stein[2]), unless the optative might express a conditional prediction (cp. 5. 97 *ἔλεγε . . ὡς οὔτε ἀσπίδα οὔτε δόρυ νομίζουσι εὐπετέες τε χειρωθῆναι εἴησαν*, a fact, and a contingency). Cp. the same combination in the simple *orat. obliq.* 9. 69. 4. Stein, however, simplifies the situation here by a new emendation; cp. App. Crit. With *θεῶν χρηστῶν εὖ ἥκειν* cp. 1. 30 *τοῦ βίου εὖ ἥκοντι* (also simply *τῆς πόλιος εὖ ἡκούσης* just before), and again, 7. 157 *supra δυνάμιός τε γὰρ ἥκεις μεγάλως.* 'Athens, among its many blessings (**καί**), will be well provided with excellent divinities.'

ἐπεὶ Ἀνδρίους γε κτλ., 'the Andrians, on the other hand, in their plentiful lack of real property were unrivalled, and had two divinities, of the opposite kind (*χρηστῶν . . ἀχρήστους*), which never quitted their island but stuck to the spot, Poverty and Inability; with these divinities for their patrons the Andrians must decline to give money; their impotence would always prove too much for the power of the Athenians.'

11. **γεωπείνης**, 'poor in land' (L. & S.), has nothing (surely) to say to land-*hunger*; in 2. 6 *γεωπεῖναι* are simply contrasted with men of large landed possession, or territory; the word presents a statistical fact, not a personal feeling.

ἐς τὰ μέγιστα ἀνήκοντας: cp. 5. 49 *τὰ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον ἐς τὰ μέγιστα ἀνήκετε ἀρετῆς πέρι.*

13. **πενίην τε καὶ ἀμηχανίην**: this pair had already been coupled by Alkaios (Bergk, *Poet. L.* iii.[4] p. 179, Fr. 92 [65]):

ἀργάλεον πενία κάκον ἄσχετον, ἃ μέγα δάμναις
λᾶον ἀμαχανίᾳ σὺν ἀδελφέᾳ.

Euripides recognizes the divinity of *Πενία*, but denies it a cult, or at least a temple: Fr. 250 (Nauck) *οὐκ ἔστι πενίας ἱερὸν ἐχθίστης θεοῦ.*

14. **ἐπηβόλους**: cp. 9. 94 *infra.*

οὐδέκοτε γὰρ . . κρέσσω: this gnome has already done duty in the mouth of the Thessalians, 7. 172 *supra.* It was probably not original in either connexion.

112. 1. **οὐ γὰρ ἐπαύετο πλεονεκτέων**: the animus is obvious. Neither the case of the Andrians nor that of the other islanders looks at all like an instance of the private greed of Themistokles. In his previous career the only allegation of corrupt and avaricious practice is the story of his bribery by the Euboians (cc. 4, 5 *supra*), the inconsequence and absurdity of which are self-evident. Rawlinson refers to the well-known lines of Timokreon (Plutarch *Them.* 21) to show that such charges were brought against Themistokles during his lifetime: no doubt —but were they proved? During and

ἐσπέμπων ἐς τὰς ἄλλας νήσους ἀπειλητηρίους λόγους αἴτεε χρήματα διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγγέλων, [χρεώμενος τοῖσι καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα ἐχρήσατο,] λέγων ὡς, εἰ μὴ δώσουσι τὸ αἰτεόμενον, ἐπάξει τὴν στρατιὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ πολιορκέων ἐξαιρήσει. λέγων ταῦτα συνέλεγε χρήματα μεγάλα παρὰ Καρυστίων τε καὶ Παρίων, οἳ πυνθανόμενοι τήν τε Ἄνδρον ὡς πολιορκέοιτο διότι ἐμήδισε, καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα ὡς εἴη ἐν αἴνῃ μεγίστῃ τῶν στρατηγῶν, δείσαντες ταῦτα ἔπεμπον χρήματα. εἰ δὲ δὴ

---

112. 2 αἴτε R 3 αὐτέων z || χρεώμενος tantum del. Cobet, van H.: totum glossema seclusi: χρεόμενος P || λόγοισι τοῖσι **B**Pz 4 βασιλέα **a**C: ἀνδρίους ceteri z, Holder, van H. 5 ἐπάξειν C: ἀπάξει **B** || σφέας ἐξαιρήσει? van H. 6 λέγων ὦν Schaefer, van H.: λέγων δὲ Reiske || τε om. **B** 8 Θεμιστοκλῆα z || τιμῇ **B**

---

after the Persian war they arose and accumulated. Themistokles was probably a wealthy man, at the time of his exile (Kritias *ap.* Aelian. *Var. Hist.* 10. 17), but there is no evidence to show how much, if any, of his fortune was obtained by illegitimate means; and it is quite certain that most of the anecdotes to illustrate the charge of avarice are apocryphal. Thucydides 1. 138. 3 neither condemns nor acquits him; cp. 2. 65. 8 for the contrasted case of Perikles.

2. **ἀπειλητηρίους λόγους**: the epithet, an *Hapaxlegomenon*, is no doubt derived from *ἀπειλή* (cp. 6. 32 *τὰς ἀπειλὰς τὰς ἐπηπείλησαν*) and has nothing to say to *ἄνδρας ἐς ἀναγκαίην ἀπειληθέντας* c. 109 *supra*!

3. **χρεώμενος . . ἐχρήσατο**: a manifest gloss. The reading varies (cp. App. Crit.). The phrase is an explanation of *τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγγέλων*. The motive for using the same messengers as used to the king would doubtless be that they could be trusted to hold their tongues (cp. c. 110 *supra*), but that should have been mentioned in connexion with the message to the Andrians; and here, without the elaborate gloss, the messengers to the Andrians would be obviously intended. *χρεώμενος* marks the gloss; Hdt. would have been content to write *διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγγέλων τοῖσι καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα ἐχρήσατο*. A perception of this may have led the inferior scribe to insert *λόγοισι* and to alter *βασιλέα* into *Ἀνδρίους*. The gloss thereby becomes doubly absurd and superfluous, between *ἀπειλητηρίους λόγους* and *λέγων ὡς κτλ.*

5. **ἐπάξει τὴν στρατιὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων.** Themistokles is represented as able to control the movements and action of the confederate fleet, at his will and pleasure; this exaggeration betrays the libel.

6. **παρὰ Καρυστίων τε καὶ Παρίων**: the specification of the two places, both of which had medized at least after Thermopylai (cp. c. 66 *supra*), among the general ruck of islanders, might tempt one to suspect that Karystos and Paros had at some time or other special relations with Themistokles. Both places were of considerable importance in connexion with the Persian wars and the *thalattocracy* of Athens. The subsequent reduction of Karystos was of sufficient interest to obtain an express notice from Thucydides (1. 98. 3); cp. 9. 105 *infra*; while Paros had already been visited some ten years previously by an Athenian squadron for 'medism' (cp. 6. 132–136 *supra*). But, in fact, when Andros, Tenos (c. 82 *supra*), Keos, Naxos, Kythnos, Seriphos, Siphnos (cp. c. 46 *supra*) have been accounted for, there is not much left in the neighbourhood of the 'Kyklades' for Themistokles to exploit, except Paros and Karystos. (The other Euboian cities, Styra, Eretria, Chalkis, were on the right side, c. 46 *supra*.)

8. **διότι ἐμήδισε**: the conjunction is perhaps favoured by the oblique or dependent construction. The reason for the visitation was their medism, not the avarice of Themistokles.

ἐν αἴνῃ: *εἶναι*, cp. 9. 16 *infra*, = *ἐπαινετὸς εἶναι*. Hdt. uses also the form *αἶνος* 7. 107 *supra*.

9. **ταῦτα** is rather vague, but must mean the possibility of their being subjected to a similar visitation.

τινὲς καὶ ἄλλοι ἔδοσαν νησιωτέων, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, δοκέω δὲ τινὰς καὶ ἄλλους δοῦναι καὶ οὐ τούτους μούνους. καίτοι Καρυστίοισί *γε οὐδὲν τούτου εἵνεκα τοῦ κακοῦ ὑπερβολὴ ἐγένετο·* Πάριοι *δὲ* Θεμιστοκλέα *χρήμασι ἱλασάμενοι διέφυγον τὸ στράτευμα.* Θεμιστοκλέης *μέν νυν ἐξ* Ἄνδρου *ὁρμώμενος χρήματα παρὰ νησιωτέων ἐκτᾶτο λάθρῃ τῶν ἄλλων στρατηγῶν.*

Οἱ *δ' ἀμφὶ* Ξέρξην *ἐπισχόντες ὀλίγας ἡμέρας μετὰ τὴν* **113** *ναυμαχίην ἐξήλαυνον ἐς* Βοιωτοὺς *τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδόν. ἔδοξε*

---

10 *ἄλλων νησιωτέων ἔδοσαν* **β** || *εἶπαι* **β***z*, van H. 11 *μόνους* C 12 *γε* om. **β** || *οὐδὲν* : *οὐδὲ* Apr. : *οὐδεμία?* van H. || *εἵνεκε* **β** 13 *Θεμιστοκλῆα z* || *ἔφυγον* ABC 14 *ὁρμεώμενος* C : *ὁρμεόμενος* **β**P*z*, Stein[1], van H. 15 *ἐκτᾶτο* Merzdorf, Stein, Holder, van H. : *ἐκτέατο* **α**C : *ἐκτέετο* **β**P : *ἠτέετο z* : *ἔκτητο* Dindorf **113.** 1 *ξέρξεα* **β**P*z* || *ἡμέρας ὀλίγας* **α**

---

10. **οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, δοκέω δέ.** Hdt. unfortunately associates himself here with the scandalmongers. He has not a scrap of evidence to adduce, but is willing to supply its place with conjecture. As above shown, there were not many places handy, besides Paros and Karystos, from which to express anything. Delos would hardly be assailable; Mykonos, Syros, Gyaros and the rest hardly worth visiting.

11. **καίτοι Καρυστίοισί γε . . ἐγένετο**: grammatically it is not quite clear whether Hdt. means that there was no postponement of the evil day for Karystos, or that there was a postponement, though not procured by their bribes to Themistokles but by some other means (e.g. the obstinate resistance of Andros); in other words, is **τούτου εἵνεκα** predicative, or is the predicate simply **οὐδὲν τοῦ κακοῦ ὑπερβολὴ ἐγένετο**? The form of the negative perhaps favours the latter interpretation; and Hdt. records below (c. 121) that Karystos was 'visited' before the Greeks returned to Salamis. The final reduction of the Karystians—evidently no easy task—was not accomplished until after the ostrakism, or perhaps the condemnation, of Themistokles. (Cp. note to 9. 109 *infra*.) That observation, as far as it goes, would suit well enough their being clients of his, and might have been cited in support of the scandal, which is refuted by the fact (if it be a fact) that Karystos was devastated by this very expedition. The sense of *ὑπερβολή* here is unusual, as if from *ὑπερβάλλεσθαι*, 7. 206, 9. 51; cp. Polyb. 14. 9. 8.

13. **ἱλασάμενοι**, generally used of propitiating gods (1. 50, 67, 4. 7) or heroes (5. 47), is doubtless used here with a special intention. Hdt. does not draw from the visitation of Karystos the inference that Themistokles had not been bribed by the Euboians, though from the escape of Paros—intelligible enough without it—he infers that the Parians had bribed the Athenian strategos.

14. **Θεμιστοκλέης μέν κτλ.**: the conjecture of four lines back becomes a precise matter of fact, by repetition: a frequent fallacy in historiography—and criticism.

113. 1. **οἱ δ' ἀμφὶ Ξέρξην.** The scene shifts back to the Persian camp (cc. 113–120). It may be true that Attica was not evacuated for some days after the naval engagement and the retreat of the Persian fleet; but if so, the Greek fleet must have remained at Salamis. (Is it even quite certain that the Persian fleet sped across the Aegean, the day after the battle?) Hdt. has now several series of synchronous movements to co-ordinate (Persian fleet, Persian army, Greek fleet, perhaps Greek army): small wonder if he fail to adjust them convincingly.

2. **τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδόν** as that by which they had come. Hdt. assumes that the whole Persian force came and went by one and the same road: unfortunately he does not specify which of the two or three possible alternatives (Eleutherai-

γὰρ Μαρδονίῳ ἅμα μὲν προπέμψαι βασιλέα, ἅμα δὲ ἀνωρίη εἶναι τοῦ ἔτεος πολεμέειν· χειμερίσαι τε ἄμεινον εἶναι ἐν Θεσσαλίῃ, καὶ ἔπειτα ἅμα τῷ ἔαρι πειρᾶσθαι τῆς Πελοποννήσου. ὡς δὲ ἀπίκατο ἐς τὴν Θεσσαλίην, ἐνθαῦτα Μαρδόνιος

---

3 γὰρ καὶ C || βασιλῆα z || ἀνωρίην **B**Pz, Holder : ἀωρίῃ Cobet, van H. 4 τε : δὲ z 5 Θετταλίῃ z || ἔπειτεν van H. 6 ἀπίκετο **B**z : ἀπικέατο P

Eleusis, Panakton-Phyle, Tanagra-Dekeleia). Unless the land-force was very small, no doubt more than one route was followed, but Xerxes and his suite may, of course, have come and gone by the same route, probably the best, via Eleusis (cp. c. 65 *supra*).

ἔδοξε . . ἅμα μὲν . . ἅμα δέ . .: the verb is used in two senses: 'appeared good' and simply 'appeared,' or 'thought right' and 'thought.' Mardonios might have remained in occupation of Attica, but the season was late for campaigning, supplies probably were difficult to procure so far south, and he wished to see the king well out of Greece. How far Hdt. had any definite information about the motives of Mardonios it is not easy to say; the intention πειρᾶσθαι τῆς Πελοποννήσου (cp. c. 100 *supra*) was never realized, and the retreat into winter quarters in Thessaly was hardly the best prognostic of it. Attica seems to have been really evacuated; but it is scarcely likely that Boiotia, Thermopylai, and Central Greece were wholly denuded of Persian troops. At the same time, the naval superiority of the Greeks after Salamis might (had they known how to use it) have made the occupation of Central Greece impracticable. Cp. Appendix VII. § 4.

3. **ἀνωρίη** appears to be a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον.

4. **χειμερίσαι**: Hdt. employs χειμερίζειν as = χειμάζειν (to winter) 6. 31, 7. 37, c. 126 *infra*, 9. 130. He has χειμάζειν in its primary sense 7. 191 *supra*. Cp. also χειμαίνειν, -εσθαι (to be tempest-tossed) c. 118 *infra*.

5. **ἅμα τῷ ἔαρι** just after the ἅμα μέν and ἅμα δέ above is not quite happy ('unconscious iteration').

6. **ἀπίκατο** is a full temporal pl.p.

Μαρδόνιος ἐξελέγετο. The process of selection would take some time: did the king remain in Thessaly, while Mardonios performed it, and not rather go on immediately, under the escort of Artabazos (cp. cc. 115, 126 *infra*)? Hdt.'s account of the selection, and of the component elements in the grand army of Mardonios when selected, is far from clear. It is neither quite self-consistent, nor quite consistent with the corresponding lists previously given in Bk. 7, which are apparently here referred to; and it is scarcely verified in the battle-roll of Plataia, 9. 31, 32 *infra*. Hdt. gives the sum total as 300,000, infantry and cavalry combined. He does not clearly indicate the proportion of the two arms, but the *corps d'armée* under Artabazos is apparently to be included, c. 126 *infra*. Nor does Hdt. treat the thirty myriads as a cadre fixed by the commander, to be filled up by the levies on selection, but as a result, more or less accidental, of the selection of the picked troops (just as at Doriskos the sum total of infantry, 1,700,000, is only discovered as a result of the *levée en masse*, when its numerical aspect is tested and proved!). Mardonios pursues two methods in his selection: certain nations, to wit, Persians, Medes, Scyths, Baktrians, Indians, he selects in full, as they stand; but of the remaining (42) nations he only takes such individuals as are of obvious value or of made reputation. Probably the five nations named supplied the bulk of the army of Mardonios. The omission of the Kissians, however, is remarkable (were they chiefly in the *corps d'armée* of Artabazos?).

But we may safely assert that if the total forces left with Mardonios comprised, even nominally, thirty myriads, then there was no selection, he retained the army of Xerxes in full: if there was a real selection, then his forces amounted to nothing like thirty myriads; cp. further Appendix II. § 5.

ἐξελέγετο πρώτους μὲν τοὺς Πέρσας πάντας τοὺς ἀθανάτους καλεομένους, πλὴν Ὑδάρνεος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ (οὗτος γὰρ οὐκ ἔφη λείψεσθαι βασιλέος), μετὰ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων Περσέων τοὺς θωρηκοφόρους καὶ τὴν ἵππον τὴν χιλίην, καὶ Μήδους τε καὶ Σάκας καὶ Βακτρίους τε καὶ Ἰνδούς, καὶ τὸν πεζὸν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἵππον. ταῦτα μὲν ἔθνεα ὅλα εἵλετο, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων ἐξελέγετο κατ᾽ ὀλίγους, τοῖσι εἴδεά τε ὑπῆρχε διαλέγων καὶ εἰ τεοῖσί τι χρηστὸν συνήδεε πεποιημένον· ἐν δὲ

---

7 *τοὺς πέρσας πάντας τοὺς* **α** : *τοὺς μυρίους πέρσας τοὺς* **β**, Holder : *πέρσας πάντας τοὺς* CPz : *Πέρσας τοὺς μυρίους τοὺς* vel *τοὺς μυρίους Πέρσας πάντας τοὺς* van H. 9 *λήψεσθαι* **β** || *βασιλέως* **β** : *βασιλῆος* z 11 *τε* om. **β**Pz 12 *ἄλλην* om. **β**, Holder, van H. || *εἵλατο* **β** || *ἄλλων* om. **α**C 14 *εἰ τέοισί τε* Cz : *εἴ τι οἱ* **β** || *συνήδεε* R : *συνειδεε* **α**CSV || *ἒν* **β**B[2] : *ἒν* AB[1] : *ἐν* reliqui

---

7. **τοὺς Πέρσας πάντας τοὺς ἀθανάτους καλεομένους**: these are identical with the corps described in 7. 83, and apparently in 7. 41, and have been twice seen in action, 7. 211, and 7. 215. (Whether they were all strictly speaking 'Persians' is doubtful, in view of the frieze from the *Apadana* now in the Louvre, which suggests that even the negrito population of Kissia was admitted to the ranks of the Immortals. But the heads are 'restored.')

8. **Ὑδάρνεος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ**: cp. 7. 83. His devotion to the king's person on this occasion was, perhaps, in part dictated by an unwillingness to serve under Mardonios; but for the captain, *stratege*, or myriarch of the Immortals to depart and leave his men behind him is a strange proceeding. Would the guards not have seen the king further than Thessaly? Were the Immortals not among the king's escort, even if they returned to take part in the campaign of 479?

9. **τῶν ἄλλων Περσέων τοὺς θωρηκοφόρους**: this designation is not quite clear, as all the Persian infantry appear to have been *θωρηκοφόροι*, cp. 7. 61, and there is nothing in 7. 40 and 54 f. to explain the use of the term here, apparently for a special body of men.

10. **τὴν ἵππον τὴν χιλίην**: which chiliad of cavalry is this? The *ἱππόται χίλιοι ἐκ Περσέων πάντων ἀπολελεγμένοι* who headed the procession out of Sardes 7. 40, or the *ἵππος ἄλλη χιλίη ἐκ Περσέων ἀπολελεγμένη* who followed the Immortals on that occasion?

11. **καὶ τὸν πεζὸν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἵππον**, 'as well infantry, as all the rest of the cavalry.' The phrase applies to all the ethnic contingents just previously named, all of whom figure in the cavalry-list (7. 84-86). *ἄλλην*, if not deleted, may be taken to mean that Mardonios not only retained the cavalry of these nations in addition to the chiliad specified, but all the cavalry. Or is *ἄλλην* merely idiomatic, like *ἄλλων* just below? Or is it dittographed from *ἄλλων*? But cp. App. Crit.

12. **ταῦτα**: assimilated by *ἔθνεα*. *τούτων* or *τούτους* might be expected.

13. **κατ᾽ ὀλίγους**: as in Thuc. 3. 111. 1 *ὑπαπῆσαν κατ᾽ ὀλίγους*, 4. 11. 3 *κατ᾽ ὀλίγας ναῦς διελόμενοι* (Wesseling). The preposition is distributive in force: 'by small lots,' in small bodies.

τοῖσι εἴδεά τε ὑπῆρχε διαλέγων: the copula is not in its strictly correct place. The plural substantive is observable, but suggests that there was a plurality, a variety, of good forms; Stein cps. *μεγάθεα* 3. 102 — where certainly the 'ants' need not all be just the same size. *διαλέγων*, as in c. 107 *supra*.

14. **ἐν δὲ πλεῖστον ἔθνος Πέρσας αἱρέετο** seems to mean that the Persians were the largest unit, the most numerous national contingent, among those he was selecting, though Hdt. immediately adds that the Medes were equally numerous. There is a parallelism between this sentence and *ταῦτα μὲν ἔθνεα ὅλα εἵλετο* (in spite of the difference of tense), and *πλεῖστον* seems to be attracted to *ἔθνος* (for *πλείστους*). *ἐν δέ* would of course be an adverbial use of

πλεῖστον ἔθνος Πέρσας αἱρέετο, ἄνδρας στρεπτοφόρους τε καὶ ψελιοφόρους, ἐπὶ δὲ Μήδους· οὗτοι δὲ τὸ πλῆθος μὲν οὐκ ἐλάσσονες ἦσαν τῶν Περσέων, ῥώμῃ δὲ ἥσσονες. ὥστε σύμπαντας τριήκοντα μυριάδας γενέσθαι σὺν ἱππεῦσι.

114 *Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ, ἐν τῷ Μαρδόνιός τε τὴν στρατιὴν διέκρινε καὶ Ξέρξης ἦν περὶ Θεσσαλίην, χρηστήριον ἐληλύθεε ἐκ Δελφῶν Λακεδαιμονίοισι, Ξέρξην αἰτέειν δίκας τοῦ Λεωνίδεω φόνου καὶ τὸ διδόμενον ἐξ ἐκείνου δέκεσθαι. πέμπουσι δὴ κήρυκα τὴν ταχίστην Σπαρτιῆται, ὃς ἐπειδὴ κατέλαβε ἐοῦσαν ἔτι πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὴν ἐν Θεσσαλίῃ, ἐλθὼν ἐς ὄψιν τὴν Ξέρξεω ἔλεγε τάδε. "ὦ βασιλεῦ Μήδων, Λακεδαιμόνιοί τέ*

---

16 τὸ om. **B**P*z*, Holder, van H. 17 *ἔσαν z* || *ἔσσονες z* **114.** 3 *ξέρξεα* **B***z*

---

the preposition, like *ἐπὶ δέ* just below; Stein supports *ἐν* by Thucyd. 3. 39. 1 *μάλιστα δὴ μίαν πόλιν ἠδικηκότας ὑμᾶς*: 3. 113. 6 *πάθος γὰρ τοῦτο μιᾷ πόλει . . μέγιστον δὴ . . ἐγένετο*: 8. 40. 2 *οἱ γὰρ οἰκέται . . μιᾷ γε πόλει . . πλεῖστοι γενόμενοι.*

15. **ἄνδρας στρεπτοφόρους τε καὶ ψελιοφόρους**: curious gear for *men*! Cp. 9. 80. The Immortals, *par exemple*, *χρυσόν τε πολλὸν καὶ ἄφθονον ἔχοντες ἐνέπρεπον* (7. 83).

17. **ῥώμῃ**: cp. 7. 103.

114. 2. **Ξέρξης ἦν περὶ Θεσσαλίην.** Hdt. seems to keep Xerxes waiting all the while Mardonios was making his selection—an improbability in itself, and hardly consistent with the emphasis laid upon the rapidity of the king's flight, cc. 115, 120 *infra*.

χρηστήριον ἐληλύθεε ἐκ Δ. Λ.: another item in Delphian apologetics; obviously the anecdote and oracle are this time at least *post eventum*. If so, is it necessary to inquire at what ideal point of time in 480 B.C. we shall date the response, or whether the Lakedaimonians had consulted the oracle concerning the death of their king? *χρηστήριον* is here the actual response, or utterance. The pluperfect appears to be rhetorical, but not temporarily incorrect; cp. c. 50 *supra*. *δίκας αἰτέειν τινά τινος* is of course the regular construction, cp. 1. 2 etc.

4. **τὸ διδόμενον ἐξ ἐκείνου δέκεσθαι.** De Pauw misunderstood: *accipere omen.* Wesseling approved. Baehr corrected: *id quod a Xerxe oblatum esset, accipere.* No doubt *δέκομαι* can be used of accepting an omen (cp. 9. 91), but also of accepting anything offered. Stein follows Baehr (apparently), and for *τὸ διδόμενον* cps. 3. 148, 8. 138, 9. 111. Below, **δεξάμενος τὸ ῥηθέν** has a slightly more oracular flavour, and though not used of accepting an oracle, is used of accepting something more than human.

5. **Σπαρτιῆται** is hardly used by Hdt. in deliberate contrast to *Λακεδαιμονίοισι* just above, and *Λακεδαιμόνιοι* just below, but merely as a literary variation.

κατέλαβε, *deprehendit*, overtook; cp. *κατελαμβάνετο* 6. 29.

6. **πᾶσαν**: not merely the select 300,000. Nor is there any hint of any garrisons south of Othrys.

7. **Μήδων**: had Sparta or Delphi not yet perceived the distinction between Medes and Persians? The use of the term generally is a kind of recognition, from the Greek side, of the continuity of the empires of Astyages, Kyros, Dareios.

Λακεδαιμόνιοί τε . . καὶ Ἡρακλεῖδαι οἱ ἀπὸ Σπάρτης. The demand is a joint one, on behalf of the state, and of the royal family—which has now a blood-feud of its own with the Achaimenids. The Herakleids of Sparta—there were other Herakleids elsewhere—had a longer pedigree than Xerxes himself; cp. 7. 11, 204, and c. 131 *infra*. It can hardly be said that the *vendetta* was wiped out by the death of Mardonios, but it does not figure as real history afterwards. (Alexander, though an Herakleid, took a very different line; cp. Arrian *Anab.* 3. 22. 1, 30. 1–3, 4. 7. 3 ff.)

σε καὶ Ἡρακλεῖδαι οἱ ἀπὸ Σπάρτης αἰτέουσι φόνου δίκας,
ὅτι σφέων τὸν βασιλέα ἀπέκτεινας ῥυόμενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα."
ὃ δὲ γελάσας τε καὶ κατασχὼν πολλὸν χρόνον, ὥς οἱ ἐτύγχανε
παρεστεὼς Μαρδόνιος, δεικνὺς ἐς τοῦτον εἶπε "τοιγάρ σφι
Μαρδόνιος ὅδε δίκας δώσει τοιαύτας οἵας ἐκείνοισι πρέπει."
ὃ μὲν δὴ δεξάμενος τὸ ῥηθὲν ἀπαλλάσσετο, Ξέρξης δὲ **115**
Μαρδόνιον ἐν Θεσσαλίῃ καταλιπὼν αὐτὸς ἐπορεύετο κατὰ
τάχος ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ ἀπικνέεται ἐς τὸν πόρον
[τῆς διαβάσιος] ἐν πέντε καὶ τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρῃσι, ἀπάγων

---

8 *αἰτέουσα* **B** 9 *βασιλῆα z* 10 *οἱ* om. SV || *ἔτυχε* **B** 11 *τοιγάρ τοι Μαρδόνιος* S (Gaisf.) **115.** 4 *τῆς διαβάσιος* del. van H., Holder, Stein³ || *ἐν* om. **B** || *τεσσαράκοντα* **B**

---

10. **ὃ δὲ γελάσας τε καὶ κατασχὼν πολλὸν χρόνον**: one does not see much to laugh at (the laugh was soon to be on the other side); but perhaps the king already had his humorous answer ready, though he must wait some considerable time to deliver it, until Mardonios is in evidence.

κατασχών: like another despot, under sorer provocation, who (6. 129) *κατεῖχε ἑωυτόν, οὐ βουλόμενος ἐκραγῆναι.*

11. **τοιγάρ σφι Μαρδόνιος . . πρέπει**: the remark is not a reply to the 'herald' but a witticism addressed to the suite (but *δεικνὺς ἐς τοῦτον*, for the benefit of the Spartan?), unless, indeed, the king spake Greek, or elaborated his jest through the medium of an interpreter. The irony of the anecdote is conspicuous, and the king's promise, or prophecy, is fulfilled, to his shame and astonishment, in 9. 64 *ἀποθνήσκει δὲ Μαρδόνιος ὑπὸ Ἀειμνήστου ἀνδρὸς ἐν Σπάρτῃ λογίμου.* But if Xerxes himself had fought and fallen at Plataia, how much more tragic, more cathartic, had been the irony! He would at least have escaped the comic Nemesis. Mardonios in death is the more dignified figure. Even the great Kyros had fallen by a woman, cp. 1. 214. But that is another story.

12. **πρέπει**: sc. *διδόναι* or *δοῦναι*: so L. & S., Krueger, Abicht, Sitzler. Rawlinson renders 'they deserve to get' (i.e. *δέξασθαι*), which gives a more pregnant and forcible sense, and is, perhaps, just grammatically possible *ad sensum.*

115. 2. **ἐπορεύετο κατὰ τάχος ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον**: considering the time of year, once it was decided that the king should not remain in Europe, probably no time was lost on the march to Asia. Yet Hdt. has not merely detained the king 'a few days' in Attica after the battle (cp. c. 113 *supra*), but has kept him waiting in Thessaly, while Mardonios picks out all the best fighting men, leaving only the refuse *ex hypothesi* to escort the king to the Hellespont! But cp. c. 126 *infra.*

3. **τὸν πόρον [τῆς διαβάσιος]**: the *πόρος* here appears to be the passage from shore to shore across the strait, by means of the bridge; cp. 7. 36 *supra.*

4. **ἐν πέντε καὶ τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρῃσι**: is this period intended to cover the march from Thessaly to the Hellespont only, or the whole course from Athens? If the latter, are 'the few days' which elapsed between the battle and the move from Athens (c. 113 *supra*) included or not? As forty-five days would be a longish time to spend over the march from Thessaly, the latter alternative, in one form or other, is to be preferred. In this case the exact figure would be more convincing if it did not happen to be exactly half the time consumed in the advance from the Hellespont to Athens, c. 51 *supra* (3 months = 90 days). In 394 B.C. Agesilaos marched from the Hellespont to Boiotia in a month, or less (Beloch, *Gr. Ges.* ii. 196); cp. Xenoph. *Ages.* 2. 1. But then he had only a relatively small force with him: Xenophon does not give the exact figures. Before the battle of Koroneia reinforcements had reached the king, and he was not inferior in numbers to the allied army opposed to him, which, a little while before, at the battle of Korinth, had

τῆς στρατιῆς οὐδὲν μέρος ὡς εἰπεῖν. ὅκου δὲ πορευόμενοι γινοίατο καὶ κατ' οὕστινας ἀνθρώπους, τὸν τούτων καρπὸν ἁρπάζοντες ἐσιτέοντο· εἰ δὲ καρπὸν μηδένα εὕροιεν, οἳ δὲ τὴν ποίην τὴν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀναφυομένην καὶ τῶν δενδρέων τὸν φλοιὸν περιλέποντες καὶ τὰ φύλλα καταδρέποντες κατήσθιον, ὁμοίως τῶν τε ἡμέρων καὶ τῶν ἀγρίων, καὶ ἔλειπον οὐδέν· ταῦτα δ' ἐποίεον ὑπὸ λιμοῦ. ἐπιλαβὼν δὲ λοιμός τε τὸν στρατὸν καὶ δυσεντερίη κατ' ὁδὸν ἔφθειρε. τοὺς δὲ καὶ νοσέοντας αὐτῶν κατέλειπε, ἐπιτάσσων τῇσι πόλισι, ἵνα ἑκάστοτε γίνοιτο ἐλαύνων, μελεδαίνειν τε καὶ τρέφειν, ἐν

5 εἶπαι z, van H. 6 τουτέων z ‖ καρπὸν: καρ R 7 ἀναρπάζοντες **ß** ‖ ἐσιτεύοντο C 8 δένδρων **ß** ‖ τόν <τε> coni. Stein, rec. van H. 9 περιβλέποντες C ‖ τὰ: κατὰ R ‖ καταδιέποντες B 10 ἔλειπον **ß**P: ἔλιπον 11 ταῦτα . . λιμοῦ del. Naber, van H. ‖ ἐποίευν z ‖ ὑπολαβὼν Cobet, van H. ‖ λιμὸς τότε z 12 διέφθειρε S 13 αὐτέων **ß**z ‖ κατέλιπε z 14 ἑκάστοθι CR ‖ γίνηται z ‖ τε om. **α**C

numbered 24,000 hoplites with 1550 cavalry, and numerous light-armed troops; cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 1, 2. 16 ff., 3. 15 ff.

ἀπάγων τῆς στρατιῆς οὐδὲν μέρος ὡς εἰπεῖν. He had left (*ex hypothesi*) 300,000 of the best with Mardonios; he was escorted by Artabazos with 60,000 of the said 300,000 (cp. c. 126 *infra*). The phrase here is apparently intended to introduce the result of the losses *en route* between Thessaly and Sardes; but these losses are themselves to be heavily discounted in the light of that authentic escort. The millions which had accompanied Xerxes into Greece had to be disposed of somehow: he sheds most of them on the way home! Have the flight and sufferings of the survivors of Plataia been antedated and transferred to the escort of Xerxes, a year before? But even in the later disaster, Artabazos carries a substantial remnant home to Asia (9. 89). The rectification of the numbers of the host of Xerxes tends to adjust the proportion of losses. Bad as this passage in Hdt. may be, as regards horrors and exaggerations, he is by no means the worst offender: his predecessor Aischylos (*Persae* 484–516) and Trogus Pompeius long afterwards (Justin 2. 13) pile up the agony more unscrupulously still. Cp. Appendix VII. § 2.

6. **καρπόν**, Blakesley objects, could not be the growing harvest, for the harvest was over; but Hdt. meets that objection in the next sentence. Nor need *καρπός* be restricted to cereals. There would of course be no hardship in this, except for the despoiled owners!

7. **οἳ δέ**: the real hardships are introduced by *δέ in apodosi*, with the subject repeated; cp. 7. 51 *supra*.

8. **ποίην**, Att. *πόαν* (cp. *ποιέω, ποέω*).

9. **φλοιόν**: cp. 4. 67. The people of Petelia ate it, during the siege in the Hannibalic war, Polyb. 7. 1. 3. *περιλέπειν* is a rare word, *Iliad* 1. 236, the only other ref. in L. & S. Baehr, however, cites Theophrastus, *Hist. pl.* 6. 4. 10, and Suidas (quoting this passage *sub v.* *Δρέπον*).

11. **ὑπό**: cp. with genitive *prae* or *propter*; cp. *ὑπὸ δέους καὶ κακοῦ* 1. 85, etc.

12. **δυσεντερίη**: cp. Plato, *Tim.* 86 A *διαρροίας καὶ δυσεντερίας καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα νοσήματα πάντα παρέσχετο.* Celsus *de medicin.* 4. 22 (15), quoted verbatim by Baehr, gives a full medical description of the symptoms and sufferings.

τοὺς δὲ καὶ νοσέοντας κτλ. Xerxes was at least more careful of the sick than his father had been beyond the Danube, according to the story 4. 135.

13. **ἵνα**, locative; **γίνοιτο**, "optative of indefinite frequency," Madvig § 133.

14. **μελεδαίνειν**: an Ionic word; cp. 7. 31.

Θεσσαλίῃ τε τινὰς καὶ ἐν Σίρι τῆς Παιονίης καὶ ἐν Μακεδονίῃ.
ἔνθα καὶ τὸ ἱρὸν ἅρμα καταλιπὼν τοῦ Διός, ὅτε ἐπὶ τὴν
Ἑλλάδα ἤλαυνε, ἀπιὼν οὐκ ἀπέλαβε, ἀλλὰ δόντες οἱ Παίονες
τοῖσι Θρήιξι ἀπαιτέοντος Ξέρξεω ἔφασαν νεμομένας ἁρπασθῆναι
ὑπὸ τῶν ἄνω Θρηίκων τῶν περὶ τὰς πηγὰς τοῦ Στρυμόνος
οἰκημένων. ἔνθα καὶ ὁ τῶν Βισαλτέων βασιλεὺς γῆς τε τῆς **116**
Κρηστωνικῆς [Θρῆιξ] ἔργον ὑπερφυὲς ἐργάσατο· ὃς οὔτε
αὐτὸς ἔφη τῷ Ξέρξῃ ἑκὼν εἶναι δουλεύσειν, ἀλλ' οἴχετο ἄνω
ἐς τὸ ὄρος τὴν Ῥοδόπην, τοῖσί τε παισὶ ἀπηγόρευε μὴ στρα-

---

15 *ἐν Σίρι τῆς Παιωνίης . . ἐν Μακεδονίῃ* transponenda vidit Stein^2, transposuit van H. || *παιονίας* C   18 *ἁρπαχθῆναι* codd. *z*   19 *καὶ τῶν περὶ* C || *πηγὰς* om. R   20 *οἰκεομένων z*   **116.** 2 *κρηστονικῆς* R || *Θρῆιξ* secl. Stein^2, Holder, van H. (*θρηὶξ* **α**: *θρῆξ* **β**C: *θρήϊξ* reliqui) || *εἰργάσατο z*   3 *τῷ* om. **β** || *ᾤχετο* **α**C   4 *οὖρος z*: *τὸ οὖρος* abesse malit van H.

---

15. **ἐν Σίρι τῆς Παιονίης**: to avoid confusion with *Σῖρις ἡ ἐν Ἰταλίῃ* c. 62 *supra*. Siris in Paionia, the chief town of the Siro- or Siriopaiones (Steph. B. *sub v. Σῖρις*), cp. 5. 15, was situate above Lake Prasias (5. 16), apparently mentioned by Livy 45. 4 *Sirae oppidum terrae Odomanticae* (Baehr ad 5. 15 suggests that it became 'Odomantian' after the removal of the Siro-paionians to Asia by Dareios). Now *Seres*, the centre of an important plain, or vale; cp. Hogarth, *Nearer East*, 89, 101; Reclus, *Univ. Geogr.* E.T. i. 112.

καὶ ἐν Μακεδονίῃ is strangely out of place, like an afterthought, a correction, a gloss. **ἔνθα** apparently refers to Siris. But cp. App. Crit.

16. **τὸ ἱρὸν ἅρμα**: 7. 40 *supra*. The road west of Siris was presumably too rough. The fact has not been recorded on the outward journey. The two passages are so wholly independent of each other that the chariot-team here is composed of mares (*νεμομένας*), which there was composed of horses. (Cp. 7. 55 *οἵ τε ἵπποι οἱ ἱροὶ καὶ τὸ ἅρμα τὸ ἱρόν*, where the horses specified are of course the ten Nesaian, not the eight white horses of 7. 40.)

19. **τῶν περὶ τὰς πηγὰς τοῦ Στρυμόνος οἰκημένων.** The sources of the Strymon (*Struma*) appears to have been in the territory of the Agrianes; cp. Strabo 331 (36) *ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς Ἀμφιπόλεως Βισάλται καὶ μέχρι πόλεως Ἡρακλείας, ἔχοντες αὐλῶνα εὔκαρπον, ὃν διαρρεῖ ὁ Στρυμών, ὡρμημένος ἐκ τῶν περὶ Ῥοδόπην Ἀγριανῶν . . οὐ μόνον δ' ὁ Ἀξιὸς ἐκ Παιόνων ἔχει τὴν ῥύσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Στρυμών· ἐξ Ἀγριάνων γὰρ διὰ Μαίδων καὶ Σιντῶν εἰς τὰ μεταξὺ Βισαλτῶν καὶ Ὀδομάντων ἐκπίπτει.* The Agrianes appear to be regarded by Thucyd. (2. 98. 3) as Paionians, though subject (in 429 B.C.) to the suzerainty of the Odrysian monarch.

116. 1. **ἔνθα καί**, repeated from c. 115 l. 16 *supra*, unless that passage is a later addition.

ὁ τῶν Βισαλτέων βασιλεύς: on the position of Bisaltia cp. Strabo *l.c.*, and 7. 115 *supra*. *γῆ ἡ Κρηστωνική* is not immediately north, but higher up, on the sources of the Cheidoros, 7. 124, 127. The king here is anonymous; but a king named 'Mosses,' dated about 500–480 B.C., is known from the coinage; cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 179; G. Macdonald, *Catalogue of Gk. Coins in the Hunterian Collection*, i. (1899) p. 269.

2. **ἔργον ὑπερφυὲς ἐργάσατο.** The epithet here appears to be used in a dyslogistic sense; in 9. 78 eulogistically; in a purely matter-of-fact way, 2. 175. The word is not uncommon in the Attic writers.

3. **ἑκὼν εἶναι**: the substantive verb purely idiomatic, 'at least willingly,' in the negative sentence (Madvig § 151. 2).

4. **τὸ ὄρος τὴν Ῥοδόπην**: one or other appositive might be a gloss; Rhodope has not been mentioned before in these Books, but occurs in 4. 49 as a mountain in Paionia. "The main skeleton of the country between the Danube and the Aegean" is well described in Arnold's

τεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα. οἱ δὲ ἀλογήσαντες, ἢ ἄλλως σφι θυμὸς ἐγένετο θεήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον, ἐστρατεύοντο ἅμα τῷ Πέρσῃ. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνεχώρησαν ἀσινέες πάντες ἓξ ἐόντες, ἐξώρυξε
117 αὐτῶν ὁ πατὴρ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς διὰ τὴν αἰτίην ταύτην. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν τοῦτον τὸν μισθὸν ἔλαβον, οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ὡς ἐκ τῆς Θρηίκης πορευόμενοι ἀπίκοντο ἐπὶ τὸν πόρον, ἐπειγόμενοι τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον τῇσι νηυσὶ διέβησαν ἐς Ἄβυδον· τὰς γὰρ σχεδίας οὐκ εὗρον ἔτι ἐντεταμένας ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χειμῶνος διαλελυμένας. ἐνθαῦτα δὲ κατεχόμενοι σιτία τε πλέω ἢ κατ' ὁδὸν ἐλάγχανον, <καὶ> οὐδένα τε κόσμον ἐμπιπλάμενοι καὶ ὕδατα μεταβάλλοντες ἀπέθνησκον τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ περιεόντος πολλοί. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἅμα Ξέρξῃ ἀπικνέονται ἐς Σάρδις.

---

5 ἀλογίσαντες z 6 θηήσασθαι **B** || τῶ ξέρξῃ **B** 8 αὐτέων **B**z
117. 3 θρήκης **B** 5 οὐχ **B** || ἐντεταγμένας C || ἀλλὰ **a** 6 δὴ z || τε om. **B**Pz, Holder 7 <καὶ> Stein[2] || τε : δὲ (omisso τε post σιτία)? Kallenberg 8 περιόντος B

---

note to Thuc. 2. 96. 4 (though Arnold's use of 'Orbelus' is hardly correct). Rhodope is that branch of the fourfold mountain system which runs down to the Aegean, dividing the valleys of the Hebros (Maritza) and Nestos (Kara Su), and breaking away into lower ranges further west, towards the Strymon. Cp. also Hogarth, *Nearer East*, pp. 24 f.

ἀπηγόρευε μή: cp. c. 111 *supra*. This Bisaltian's apparent phil-Hellenism is noticeable: he did not take his cue from Macedon, nor perhaps anticipate the subsequent invasions of his territory by Athenian adventurers.

5. **ἀλογήσαντες**: c. 46 *supra*.

ἢ ἄλλως . . ἐγένετο: the grammatical co-ordination is not exact. ἄλλως as in 4. 148, *εἴ τε δή οἱ ἡ χώρη ἤρεσε, εἴτε καὶ ἄλλως ἠθέλησε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι*. But there is not really a true alternative involved.

7. **ἀσινέες**: cp. c. 19 *supra*. The fact does not support the traditions of the hardships of this campaign.

ἐξώρυξε . . τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς: such a punishment was non-Hellenic, barbarous, as Aelian 5. 11, narrating this anecdote, expressly notices. Cp. 4. 2 *supra*. But Hdt. seems to suggest that they deserved it (*τοῦτον τὸν μισθόν*). The words **διὰ τὴν αἰτίην ταύτην** add nothing to the force of the passage, unless it be supposed that there was another view of the motive for the king's inhuman action, e.g. a suspicion of a plot to depose him, or what not.

117. 3. **τὸν πόρον**: not the bridge, for the bridge was *ex hypothesi* gone, but perhaps the place where the bridge should have been—i.e. the passage across (not adown) the straits; cp. c. 115 *supra*.

4. **τῇσι νηυσί**: the ships had made for the Hellespont from Salamis *διαφυλαξούσας τὰς σχεδίας πορευθῆναι βασιλέι*, c. 107 *supra*. But according to this text the bridges were no longer taut (*ἐντεταμένας* 7. 34, 9. 106, 114), and the ships had to be used to convey Xerxes, and the remnant of his forces, across the Hellespont. Blakesley challenges this tradition: Aischylos takes Xerxes back over the bridge (*Pers.* 725), and the Greeks, a year later, on Hdt.'s own showing, were still ignorant of the supposed destruction of the bridges in the course of the summer or autumn of 480 B.C.

6. **κατεχόμενοι**: probably passive in force; cp. c. 114 *supra*. **ἐμπιπλάμενοι**, very distinctly middle.

7. **οὐδένα . . κόσμον** = *ἀκόσμως*: this adverbial or modal accusative is observable.

ὕδατα μεταβάλλοντες: they must have been doing so all the way from Attica, and not merely after crossing the Hellespont. Nothing is said of the failure of the rivers on the way back. The mere change of drinking water, if the water in itself was good, could hardly have the effects ascribed to it, *pace* Hippocrat. *περὶ ἀέρων κτλ.* 2.

9. **ἐς Σάρδις**: where he remained for a considerable time; cp. 9. 107 *infra*.

Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος, ὡς ἐπειδὴ Ξέρξης **118** ἀπελαύνων ἐξ Ἀθηνέων ἀπίκετο ἐπ᾽ Ἠιόνα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι, ἐνθεῦτεν οὐκέτι ὁδοιπορίῃσι διεχρᾶτο, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν στρατιὴν Ὑδάρνεϊ ἐπιτράπει ἀπάγειν ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον, αὐτὸς δ᾽ ἐπὶ νεὸς Φοινίσσης ἐπιβὰς ἐκομίζετο ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην. πλέοντα δέ μιν ἄνεμον Στρυμονίην ὑπολαβεῖν μέγαν καὶ κυματίην. καὶ δὴ μᾶλλον γάρ τι χειμαίνεσθαι γεμούσης τῆς νεός, ὥστε ἐπὶ τοῦ καταστρώματος ἐπεόντων συχνῶν Περσέων τῶν σὺν Ξέρξῃ κομιζομένων, ἐνθαῦτα ἐς δεῖμα πεσόντα τὸν βασιλέα εἰρέσθαι βώσαντα τὸν κυβερνήτην εἴ τίς ἐστί σφι σωτηρίη, καὶ τὸν εἶπαι "δέσποτα, οὐκ ἔστι οὐδεμία, εἰ μὴ τούτων ἀπαλλαγή τις γένηται τῶν πολλῶν ἐπιβατέων." καὶ Ξέρξην λέγεται ἀκούσαντα ταῦτα εἰπεῖν "ἄνδρες Πέρσαι, νῦν τις διαδεξάτω ὑμέων βασιλέος κηδόμενος· ἐν ὑμῖν γὰρ οἶκε εἶναι ἐμοὶ ἡ σωτηρίη." τὸν μὲν ταῦτα λέγειν, τοὺς δὲ προσκυνέοντας

---

118. 1 λεγόμενος λόγος z 2 ἀθηνέων AP: ἀθηναίων || ἐπ᾽: ἐς? Kallenberg 3 ἐνθεῦτεν om. **ß** || διεχρῆτο **a**C: διεχρέετο 4 ὑδάρνει ABPz || ἐπιτρέπει libri 5, 7 νεὼς C: νηὸς **ß**z (bis) || πλώοντα **ß** 9 βασιλῆα z 10 κυβερνίτην B: κυβερνήτεα **ß**z || ἔστι R, van H. || σφι om. P: σφίσι? van H. 11 εἶπε C || οὐ δὲ μία AB: οὐδεμίη z || εἰ: ἦν **ß**, Holder, van H. || τουτέων z 12 ξέρξεα **ß**z || λέγεται secl. van H. 13 εἶπαι RSz, Holder, van H.: εἶπε V 14 βασιλῆος z || ἔοικεν **ß** || ἐμοὶ εἶναι z || ἡ om. **ß**

---

118. 1. **ἄλλος ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος**, 'another story is told, to the following effect . .' The formula does not prove that the variant had not been reduced to writing (cp. Introduction, § 10). If it had been merely an oral tradition perhaps Hdt. would not have been at such pains to refute it.

2. **Ἠιόνα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι**: cp. 7. 25.

3. **ὁδοιπορίῃσι**: of journeys by land; the plural perhaps only idiomatic or rhetorical (like ἀβουλίῃσι c. 97 *supra*). Cp. 3. 52 ἀλουσίῃσί τε καὶ ἀσιτίῃσι, which Stein regards as Homeric.

4. **Ὑδάρνεϊ**: cp. c. 113 *supra*. This story coheres with that anecdote, and is contradicted by the story (probably truer) of Artabazos c. 126 *infra*, though Hdt. misses this argument.

ἐπὶ νεὸς Φοινίσσης: of course; cp. 7. 128 *supra*.

6. **ἄνεμον Στρυμονίην**. It was

> πνοαὶ δ᾽ ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος μολοῦσαι
> κακόσχολοι, νήστιδες, δύσορμοι,

that detained the fleet of Agamemnon at Aulis (Aischyl. *Ag.* 192 f.). Cp. Aristotle, *de vent.* σ 973 B Θρᾳκίας κατὰ μὲν Θρᾴκην Στρυμονίας, πνεῖ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ. (It does not, however, figure on the octagonal 'Tower of the Winds' in Athens.) Baehr considers it equivalent to Boreas. 'Strymonian' is presumably a purely geographical expression. Hdt. has suddenly changed into *orat. obliq.* after having started with ὡς and the *recta*, as in c. 111 *supra*.

7. **χειμαίνεσθαι**, cp. c. 113 *supra*, seems to be a poetical word, an observation not contravened by its (metaphorical) use in Aristotle, *Poet.* 17. 3. It is not quite plain whether the construction here is transitive (passive) or intransitive (neuter); and if transitive, whether τὴν νέα or τὸν βασιλέα should be understood as subject.

13. **διαδεξάτω . . κηδόμενος**, 'may prove his care of . .'; cp. 3. 72 δεικνύσθω ἐνθαῦτα ἐὼν πολέμιος. With the **τις** cp. c. 109 *supra*.

14. **ἐν ὑμῖν**: cp. c. 60 *supra*.

15. **προσκυνέοντας**: cp. 7. 136 *supra*. That even in this supreme hour the

ἐκπηδᾶν ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ τὴν νέα ἐπικουφισθεῖσαν οὕτω δὴ ἀποσωθῆναι ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην. ὡς δὲ ἐκβῆναι τάχιστα ἐς γῆν τὸν Ξέρξην, ποιῆσαι τοιόνδε· ὅτι μὲν ἔσωσε βασιλέος τὴν ψυχήν, δωρήσασθαι χρυσέῃ στεφάνῃ τὸν κυβερνήτην, ὅτι δὲ Περσέων *πολλοὺς ἀπώλεσε, ἀποταμεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.*

119 *οὗτος δὲ ἄλλος λέγεται λόγος περὶ τοῦ Ξέρξεω νόστου, οὐδαμῶς ἔμοιγε πιστὸς οὔτε ἄλλως οὔτε τὸ* Περσέων *τοῦτο πάθος. εἰ γὰρ δὴ ταῦτα οὕτω εἰρέθη ἐκ τοῦ κυβερνήτεω πρὸς Ξέρξην, ἐν μυρίῃσι γνώμῃσι μίαν οὐκ ἔχω ἀντίξοον μὴ οὐκ ἂν ποιῆσαι βασιλέα τοιόνδε, τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ καταστρώματος καταβιβάσαι ἐς κοίλην νέα ἐόντας* Πέρσας *καὶ* Περσέων *τοὺς πρώτους, τῶν δ' ἐρετέων ἐόντων* Φοινίκων *ὅκως οὐκ ἂν ἴσον πλῆθος τοῖσι* Πέρσῃσι *ἐξέβαλε ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν. ἀλλ' ὃ*

16 *ἐκπηδέειν* **B** || *νῆα* Rz 18 *ξέρξεα* **B**z || *βασιλῆος* z 19 *χρυσέω στεφάνω* **B**: *χρυσέῳ στεφάνῳ* Holder, van H. || *κυβερνίτην* B: *κυβερνήτεα* **B**z **119.** 1 *ἄλλος* **B**: *ἄλλως* || *λέγεται ὁ λόγος* CPz: *λόγος λέγεται* **B** 2 *ἄλλως* **B**z: *ἄλλος* (‘ni fuit potius ὁ ἄλλος’ Stein) || *τὸ* post *τοῦτο* **B** 3 *οὕτω* CPz: *οὕτως* || *ἠρέθη* C: *ἐρρέθη* **B**: *ἐρρήθη* Pz 4 *τὸν ξέρξεα* **B**: *ξέρξεα* z || *μίην* z || *ἔχω*: *ἔξω* Krueger, van H. || *μὴ* om. **B** 5 *βασιλῆα* z || *ἐπὶ*: *ἐκ* **B**, Holder, van H. 6 *νῆα* **B**z || *καὶ τῶν* **B** 7 *δὲ* **a** || *ἐρετριέων* **B** || *κῶς* Pingel, van H. || *ἶσον* R 8 *θάλασσαν;* (Pingel) van H.

forms of Persian court etiquette are not omitted is a touch not so much of verisimilitude as of humour.

19. **ψυχήν**: 7. 39 *supra*.

20. **ἀποταμεῖν τὴν κεφαλήν**: on beheading, 7. 35 *supra*; did he wear the crown at his execution? The anecdote illustrates the despot's cowardice and caprice, and the ludicrous loyalty of his subjects; it is a part of the comic Nemesis, though a trifle grim.

119. 2. **οὐδαμῶς ἔμοιγε πιστός.** Hdt. is no doubt right in discrediting the story, but the point he emphasizes against it seems a poor one. Persian grandees would have been but sorry hands at the oars compared to the Phoenician tars; and the process of pitching a lot of the oarsmen into the sea, during a raging storm, to make way for those aristocratic amateurs, might not have been easy or expeditious. Hdt. relates a story which he discredits perhaps on the principle laid down 7. 152.

οὔτε ἄλλως οὔτε τὸ Περσέων τοῦτο πάθος: reading *ἄλλως* the construction seems irregular (which is better, however, than the very tame *ὁ ἄλλος*); for is *τὸ πάθος* nominative (subject) or accusative (of reference, limitation)? The latter seems preferable. *ἄλλως* itself is simple enough here (‘in other respects’); cp. c. 116 *supra*. The *πάθος* is self-inflicted in this case.

4. **ἐν μυρίῃσι γνώμῃσι μίαν . . ἀντίξοον**: does Hdt. mean that he had often discussed the story, and never found a single person dispute his point? Or does he merely wish to emphasize his own conviction by asserting that, if ten thousand opinions were polled, they would all be found to agree with him? *ἀντίξοος*, cp. 7. 218 *supra*. The apodosis in the conditional sentence is not *οὐκ ἔχω*, strictly speaking, but *οὐκ ἂν ποιῆσαι. οὐκ ἔχω . . μὴ οὐκ ἂν ποιῆσαι* is a clear case of the idiomatic use of the double negative *μὴ οὐ*. Instead of *μὴ οὐκ ἂν ποιῆσαι* Hdt. might have written *ὅκως οὐκ ἂν ἐποίησε*, as he writes below *ὅκως οὐκ ἂν ἐξέβαλε* instead of *μὴ οὐκ ἂν ἐκβαλεῖν*. But Pingel's emendation (vide App. Crit.) is seductive.

6. **ἐς κοίλην νέα**, ‘into the ship's hold.’

μέν, ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται, ὁδῷ χρεώμενος ἅμα τῷ
ἄλλῳ στρατῷ ἀπενόστησε ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην. μέγα δὲ καὶ τόδε **120**
μαρτύριον· φαίνεται γὰρ Ξέρξης ἐν τῇ ὀπίσω κομιδῇ ἀπικό-
μενος ἐς Ἄβδηρα καὶ ξεινίην τέ σφι συνθέμενος καὶ δωρησά-
μενος αὐτοὺς ἀκινάκῃ τε χρυσέῳ καὶ τιήρῃ χρυσοπάστῳ. καὶ
ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι Ἀβδηρῖται, λέγοντες ἔμοιγε οὐδαμῶς πιστά,
πρῶτον <αὐτοῦ> ἐλύσατο τὴν ζώνην φεύγων ἐξ Ἀθηνέων
ὀπίσω, ὡς ἐν ἀδείῃ ἐών. τὰ δὲ Ἄβδηρα ἵδρυται πρὸς τοῦ
Ἑλλησπόντου μᾶλλον ἤδη τοῦ Στρυμόνος καὶ τῆς Ἠιόνος,
ὅθεν δή μιν φασὶ ἐπιβῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν νέα.

---

9 *μοι* om. **B**P, Stein[1] || *χρεόμενος* P, van H. **120** totum caput necnon c. praeced. a verb. *οὔτε ἄλλως* suspect. hab. Krueger, Kallenberg 3 *ξενίην* **B** 4 *τε* om. **B** || *τιήρῃ* Stein[1 2], etc.: *τιάρῃ* Stein[3]: *τιήρη* **B**: *τιήρει* **a**: *τριήρει* CP: *τριήρεϊ* z 5 *οὐδαμῶς ἔμοιγε* **B**: *μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐμοὶ* z 6 <*αὐτοῦ*> van H., Stein[3] || *ἀθηναίων* B**B**Cz 7 *πρὸς τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου δὲ μᾶλλον τὰ Αβδηρα ἵδρυται ἢ* z 8 *ἤδη* Stein[3]: *ἢ* (om. **B**) 9 *νῆα* **B**z: post hanc voc. *λει*^π *στι*^χχ *κ̃* (sc. *λείπουσι στίχοι εἴκοσι*) exhib. B[m]

---

9. **ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται**: the reference back is but to cc. 115–117 *supra*.

ἅμα τῷ ἄλλῳ στρατῷ: a merely idiomatic *ἄλλος* without distinct reference to any division of the army; cp. c. 113 *supra*.

120. 1. **μέγα δὲ καὶ τόδε μαρτύριον**: the point here made is a convincing one, the fact being admitted. *τόδε* is not merely the exact position of the town, nor the fact that Xerxes reached it on his return; for neither of these by itself would prove the point; but more generally the whole argument which comprises both items.

2. **φαίνεται . . ἀπικόμενος.** No real proof is given that the visit of Xerxes to Abdera was *ἐν τῇ ὀπίσω κομιδῇ* (cp. c. 108 *supra*); the *ξεινίη* might have been established, and the gifts presented, on the outward journey, 7. 109 *supra*; cp. 7. 120.

4. **ἀκινάκῃ**: *Περσικὸν ξίφος τὸν ἀκινάκην καλέουσι* 7. 54 *supra*.

τιήρῃ: cp. 7. 61 *supra*. For *χρυσόπαστος* cp. Aischyl. *Ag.* 776 (769) *τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ᾽ ἔδεθλα*.

5. **ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι Ἀβδηρῖται**: they must have been the ultimate authority for the previous statement which Hdt. accepts, as much as for the subsequent statement which he rejects (**λέγοντες ἔμοιγε οὐδαμῶς πιστά**). The argument and sentence are incomplete without the insertion of *ἐς Ἄβδηρα* or *παρὰ σφέας ἀπικόμενος* or *αὐτοῦ*: cp. App. Crit. The statement would be entirely inconsistent with Hdt.'s own previous narrative (e.g. c. 114 *supra*), as well as improbable in itself; it illustrates the growth of the legend of Xerxes' flight (**φεύγων**). The story of Artabazos also contradicts it; but Hdt. takes no heed of that.

6. **ἐλύσατο τὴν ζώνην**: i.e. changed his raiment. Stein well cps. the vow of Histiaios 5. 106 *supra*. *ζώνη* was not an exclusively male article of dress (cp. L. & S. and 1. 51). It has been regarded as emblematic of virility in the one sex, and of chastity in the other (cp. Sir R. Temple in the *Cambridge Review*, vol. xxvi. No. 643, p. xxix.).

8. **μᾶλλον ἤδη τοῦ Στρυμόνος.** Hdt. must certainly have meant to say that Abdera was nearer than Eion to the Hellespont, not that it was nearer to the Hellespont than to the Strymon. The point is necessary to the argument, but it is only obtained by an emendation. The substitution of the Strymon for Eion in the comparison is awkward, and perhaps led to the corruption. Blakesley, who obelizes cc. 118, 119 on account of the weakness of the argument in c. 119, regards this sentence as a mere gloss; i.e. a fraud within the fraud. Cp. App. Crit.

9. **φασί**: the authors of the story in c. 118 *supra*.

121 Οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ἐπείτε οὐκ οἷοί τε ἐγίνοντο ἐξελεῖν τὴν Ἄνδρον, τραπόμενοι ἐς Κάρυστον καὶ δηιώσαντες αὐτῶν τὴν χώρην ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς Σαλαμῖνα. πρῶτα μέν νυν τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἐξεῖλον ἀκροθίνια ἄλλα τε καὶ τριήρεας τρεῖς Φοινίσσας, τὴν μὲν ἐς Ἰσθμὸν ἀναθεῖναι, ἥ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν, τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ Σούνιον, τὴν δὲ τῷ Αἴαντι αὐτοῦ ἐς Σαλαμῖνα. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο διεδάσαντο τὴν ληίην καὶ τὰ ἀκροθίνια ἀπέπεμψαν ἐς Δελφούς, ἐκ τῶν ἐγένετο ἀνδριὰς ἔχων ἐν τῇ

---

121. 1 ἐγένοντο CPz || ἐξελέειν **B** 2 δηώσαντες **B** || αὐτέων z 5 ἀναθῆναι C || καὶ om. C 6 δ' ἐπὶ **a** || 'an αὐτόσε [ἐς Σαλαμῖνα]?' van H. 7 τοῦτο del. van H. || τὰ om. **B** || ἔπεμψαν **B**

---

121. 1. οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες: the scene shifts back to Hellas (cc. 121–125) and resumes the story dropped in c. 112. The Greeks are foiled at Andros (even as Miltiades had been foiled at Paros, some nine or ten years before, 6. 132 ff.). Karystos is devastated, Rawlinson solemnly remarking that Themistokles seems to have lacked the influence, or the honesty, to keep his bargain with these unfortunates. What is really here disproved is the bargain. **αὐτῶν**: sc. *τῶν Καρυστίων*.

3. **ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς Σαλαμῖνα.** Had they ever really quitted it? Are the operations against Andros and Karystos correctly dated, or are they duplicates, by anticipation, of the subsequent operations of the Athenian alliance?

τοῖσι θεοῖσι. Had Polytheism a more vivid sense of the divine presences and operations than our Christendom? The nations nowadays seldom venture upon particular offerings to the Deity in acknowledgement of victory. Or does our religion dispose us rather to set the higher powers and graces on the losing side?

4. **ἐξεῖλον** after *ἐξελεῖν* just above, in a totally different sense, is not happy, is an 'unconscious iteration.'

ἀκροθίνια: a poetical word (but found in the sing., Thuc. 1. 132. 2) and properly an adjective. **ἀναθεῖναι** appears to be an epexegetical infinitive, nor does it involve the conclusion that these dedications were carried out, or set up, immediately.

5. **ἥ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν.** It is surely a curious remark for Hdt. to make, that of the three Phoenician triremes dedicated for erection, one at the Isthmos, one at Sunion, and one in Salamis, the first was still in existence down to his own day. What then of the other two? Had they disappeared? Or had Hdt. seen the one at the Isthmos, but not the other two? Or had he certain information about the first, but not about the others? It is remarkable that two of these national dedications were to be upon Attic soil, and that of those two Hdt. appears to have no precise knowledge.

6. **τῷ Αἴαντι.** Hdt. does not specify to whom the dedications at Sunion and the Isthmos were made; presumably to Athene and to Poseidon—by so little were the gods and heroes then distinguished. Aias is of course the Aiakid, cp. c. 64 *supra*. **αὐτοῦ**, 'on the spot.'

7. **μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο**: i.e. after the *ἐξαίρεσις ἀκροθινίων*. 'The' *ἀκροθίνια* sent to Delphi had presumably been included in the operation, before the division of the spoil; but each state, to whom a share of booty fell, had also to make an offering to Delphi, though the point is not quite clearly put by Hdt. We learn also from Pausanias, *l.c. infra*, that individual commanders made offerings at Delphi from their shares of the spoil.

8. **ἐκ τῶν ἐγένετο**: the actual fabrication and erection of this statue, the collective dedication of the Greeks from the victory of Salamis, can hardly have been effected until the victory of Plataia had placed the loyalty and the security of Delphi on a new footing. Hdt. does not specify the subject of the statue. Pausanias 10. 14. 3 (5) is more explicit, without fully describing the type: *Ἕλληνες δὲ οἱ ἐναντία βασιλέως πολεμήσαντες ἀνέθεσαν μὲν Δία ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν χαλκοῦν, ἀνέθεσαν δὲ καὶ ἐς Δελφοὺς Ἀπόλλωνα ἀπὸ ἔργων τῶν ἐν ταῖς ναυσὶν ἐπί τε Ἀρτεμισίῳ καὶ ἐν*

χειρὶ ἀκρωτήριον νεός, ἐὼν μέγαθος δυώδεκα πηχέων· ἑστήκεε δὲ οὗτος τῇ περ ὁ Μακεδὼν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χρύσεος. πέμ- **122** ψαντες δὲ ἀκροθίνια οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐπειρώτων τὸν θεὸν κοινῇ εἰ λελάβηκε πλήρεα καὶ ἀρεστὰ τὰ ἀκροθίνια. ὁ δὲ παρ' Ἑλλήνων μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἔφησε ἔχειν, παρὰ Αἰγινητέων δὲ οὔ, ἀλλὰ ἀπαίτεε αὐτοὺς τὰ ἀριστήια τῆς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίης. Αἰγινῆται δὲ πυθόμενοι ἀνέθεσαν ἀστέρας χρυσέους, οἳ ἐπὶ ἱστοῦ χαλκέου ἑστᾶσι τρεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γωνίης, ἀγχοτάτω τοῦ Κροίσου κρητῆρος.

---

9 χερὶ z || ἀκρωτήριον post ἔχων **B** || νεὼς **B**CP : νηὸς z || δυωκαίδεκα **a** || ἕστηκε RSV, van H. (ἑστηκε **B** ap. Holder) **122.** 2 ἐπηρώτων **B**CP : ἐπηρώτεον z 4 ὁ δὲ παλλήνων A^1 || ἔχει z || παρ' **B**Pz 5 ἀλλ' Pz 8 ἀγχοτάτωι **a**P || κροίσου Pz : χρυσοῦ **B** : κροίσεω (Κροισείου coni. Stein[2], recep. Holder)

Σαλαμῖνι. Apollo had precious little claim to an offering from Salamis (and it might have been the god's guilty conscience which led him to decline the offering of Themistokles! Pausan. *l.c.* He could hardly have been wroth with the Athenian for the defence of the medizers, Plutarch *Themist.* 20).

9. **ἑστήκεε δὲ . . ὁ χρύσεος.** To mark the position of the god's by the man's image, if both were still *in situ*, is an odd procedure. [Demosth.] 12. 164 Φιλιπ. ἐπιστ. mentions 'the golden Alexander' as an offering at Delphi made by Alex. I. from the spoil (τῶν αἰχμαλώτων Μήδων) captured by him on the site of Amphipolis — a very questionable item of history. Blakesley regards ἑστήκεε . . ὁ χρύσεος as the note of a later editor, on two grounds: (1) a portrait statue of a living person would be an anachronism; (2) a gold statue seems too rich for the Makedonians of the period; and thinks the Alexander here named was Alex. Magnus. As to (2), the statue would be bronze gilt, and Alexander was wealthy, cp. 5. 17. As to (1), the portrait was probably an ideal, and the text above cited is some confirmation of Hdt.

122. 1. **πέμψαντες δέ.** Hdt. seems to assume that this mission and inquiry followed at once, and at the same time. But a more or less considerable interval is involved (*a*) in the military situation, which would make such offerings an absurdity, while Mardonios was still about; (*b*) in the implicit assumption that various states had made separate offerings; (*c*) in the time necessary for the designing and execution of such dedications. In this 'common inquiry by the Hellenes' we may fairly see the hand of the Amphiktyons, at the date of the attempted revival and development of the League, the rehabilitation of Delphi, and the reaction against Athens and the Delian movement; cp. 7. 228 *supra*.

5. **τὰ ἀριστήια τῆς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίης**, 'the prize of valour for the sea-fight at Salamis.' The Aiginetans themselves had obtained the first prize in the battle (c. 93 *supra*); and this passage has generally been taken to mean that the god made a special demand upon the Aiginetans, as the ἀριστεύσαντες. Stein more subtly interprets the god as claiming for himself the award, and conjectures that the Aiginetans had been favoured in the fight with a propitious sign, such as befell Lysander at Aigospotami (Plutarch *Lysandr.* 12), viz. an apparition of the *Dioskuroi*, and of Apollon Delphinios, a special patron of the Aiginetans—the three being represented by the stars on the Aiginetan offering. This explanation is acceptable, and is endorsed by Busolt ii.[2] 716. 3. It was a compliment to the Aiginetans, and a set-back to Athens: it was also a direct claim, advanced by Delphi, to a credit for the victory at Salamis. Perhaps the Aiginetans had already offered the mast with two stars (at the yard-arm's ends) (the Dioscuroi), and had only to add a third, and larger star, above, to represent the sun-god.

7. **γωνίης**: sc. τοῦ προνηίου 1. 51.

123 Μετὰ δὲ τὴν διαίρεσιν τῆς ληίης ἔπλεον οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἀριστήια δώσοντες τῷ ἀξιωτάτῳ γενομένῳ Ἑλλήνων ἀνὰ τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον. ὡς δὲ ἀπικόμενοι οἱ στρατηγοὶ διένεμον τὰς ψήφους ἐπὶ τοῦ Ποσειδέωνος τῷ βωμῷ, τὸν πρῶτον καὶ τὸν δεύτερον κρίνοντες ἐκ πάντων, ἐνθαῦτα πᾶς τις αὐτῶν ἑωυτῷ ἐτίθετο τὴν ψῆφον, αὐτὸς ἕκαστος δοκέων ἄριστος γενέσθαι, δεύτερα δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ συνεξέπιπτον Θεμιστοκλέα κρίνοντες. οἳ μὲν δὴ ἐμουνοῦντο, Θεμιστοκλέης δὲ

---

123. 1 ἔπλωον **B**z, van H. 4 διενέμοντο Pz: ἔφερον **B**: 'Num διέφερον?' van H. || ποσειδέονος B 5 κρινέοντες van H. 6 αὐτέων z: om. **B** 7 δὲ om. C || ξυνεξέπιπτον **B** || Θεμιστοκλῆα z 8 ἐμουνοῦτο A[1]: ἐμυοῦντο C

The *Krater of Kroisos* must be the silver one, for the gold one was in the Treasury of Klazomenai; *ib.* This little chapter looks very like an addition of the second hand; cp. Introduction, § 9.

123. 1. **μετὰ δὲ τὴν διαίρεσιν τῆς ληίης**: these words, carrying back over c. 122, show that the Aiginetan episode just recounted belongs to a later date, and suggest that the record of it may be an insertion, not of the first draft; see preceding note.

2. **ἀριστήια δώσοντες**: the prize is not a mere ideal award, but sufficiently material to pass from hand to hand; cp. next c.

3. **ἀνὰ τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον.** This proposal to award the prize for the war—which is not yet over—is a little premature. Did the Greeks then believe that the war was over (cp. c. 109 *supra*)? Or is this episode at the Isthmos antedated some twelve months? Or is it altogether apocryphal? It has a somewhat fabulous air. Pliny 34. 53 has a similar anecdote of Polykleitos, presumably plagiarized from this.

οἱ στρατηγοί: apparently of the fleet: the admirals (but was Aristeides among them?). The fleet is all apparently supposed to have moved to the Isthmos. The Peloponnesian army too might still be there; but its organization was probably different from that of the fleet, and in any case its commanders could hardly be conceived as awarding each to himself the prize on this occasion.

4. **διένεμον τὰς ψήφους ἐπὶ τ. Ποσειδέωνος τῷ βωμῷ**: a specially solemn procedure, designed to secure an absolutely honest decision, as in judicial proceedings (Plutarch *Perikl.* 32 οἱ δὲ δικασταὶ τὴν ψῆφον ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ φέροντες . . κρίνοιεν). διανέμειν τὰς ψήφους apparently means to divide the votes among the (possible) competitors for first and second place. Cp. διαφέρειν τὴν ψῆφον 4. 138. φέρειν, τίθεσθαι would be more usual. How the voting was actually conducted does not clearly appear. Perhaps there were two urns upon the altar, into one of which each strategos put an *ostrakon*, with the name of his nominee for first place inscribed upon it, and into the other that for the second place; in the scrutiny it would have been discovered that in the first urn no two *ostraka* bare the same name, while in the second every sherd was inscribed with the name of Themistokles. (But how did the Athenian himself vote?) The shrine of Poseidon and its contents are described by Pausanias 2. 1. 7–9, for his own day; the temple in 480 B.C. was presumably the sixth-century edifice, of which remains have been found; cp. Frazer iii. 11.

7. **οἱ πολλοὶ συνεξέπιπτον**: cp. c. 49 *supra*; here (as in 5. 22) the verb is used with a personal subject, but appears to have merely the meaning 'coincided,' agreed; the fortuitous character of the agreement may have suggested the use of the word.

Θεμιστοκλέα κρίνοντες: sc. τὸν δεύτερον εἶναι. **δεύτερα** just above is merely adverbial.

8. **οἳ μὲν δὴ ἐμουνοῦντο**: they were left each with one vote only (for first place). The same remark, however, applies to Themistokles, so that the contrast here is not quite complete.

δευτερείοισι ὑπερεβάλλετο πολλόν. οὐ βουλομένων δὲ ταῦτα 124 κρίνειν τῶν Ἑλλήνων φθόνῳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἀποπλεόντων ἑκάστων ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν ἀκρίτων, ὅμως Θεμιστοκλέης ἐβώσθη τε καὶ ἐδοξώθη εἶναι ἀνὴρ πολλὸν Ἑλλήνων σοφώτατος ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα. ὅτι δὲ νικῶν οὐκ ἐτιμήθη πρὸς τῶν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχησάντων, αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα ἐς Λακεδαίμονα ἀπίκετο θέλων τιμηθῆναι· καί μιν Λακεδαιμόνιοι καλῶς μὲν ὑπεδέξαντο, μεγάλως δὲ ἐτίμησαν. ἀριστήια μέν νυν ἔδοσαν . . Εὐρυβιάδῃ ἐλαίης στέφανον, σοφίης δὲ καὶ δεξιότητος Θεμιστοκλέι καὶ τούτῳ στέφανον ἐλαίης· ἐδωρήσαντό τέ μιν ὄχῳ τῷ ἐν Σπάρτῃ καλλιστεύσαντι. αἰνέσαντες δὲ πολλά,

9 ὑπερέβαλλε **B** **124.** 2 ἀποπλωόντων **B**z 3 ἐβοήθη C 4 ἐδοξώσθη z || πολλῶν BCz || Ἑλλήνων del. van H. 5 νικῶν 'suspectum' Stein²: φιλονικέων? Stein³ 9 ἀνδραγαθίης vel e Plutarch. Them. c. 17, Mor. p. 871 ἀνδρηίης supplend. cens. Stein et alii 10 τέ: δέ CPz **11** καλλιστεύοντι **B**, Holder, van H.

9. **δευτερείοισι ὑπερεβάλλετο**: sc. *τοὺς ἄλλους στρατηγούς*. *δευτερεῖα* (*εὐδαιμονίης*) 1. 32; *ὑπερβάλλεσθαι* c. 24 *supra*; and 1. 61 *Θηβαῖοι ὑπερεβάλοντο τῇ δόσι τῶν χρημάτων*.

124. 1. **οὐ βουλομένων δὲ . . φθόνῳ**: the sentence may be taken to refer to the judicial fiasco just recorded. **τῶν Ἑλλήνων**=*τῶν στρατηγῶν*. But without much pressing the passage might be taken to refer to a refusal to decide the question on appeal, **ἑκάστων** (each set and each contingent) just below favouring that too. **ἀκρίτων** is plainly active, 'without giving a decision.'

φθόνος is the besetting sin of Greek citizenship, cp. 7. 236 *supra*, and was not eliminated between confederates.

3. **ἐβώσθη τε κτλ.**: cp. 6. 131 *οὕτω Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ἐβώσθησαν ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα*.

7. **θέλων τιμηθῆναι**: this motivation again betrays animus (cp. c. 112 *supra*). The visit of Themistokles to Lakedaimon in the autumn or winter (480–79) was probably by invitation (cp. Plutarch *Themist.* 17), and may have had deeper political and diplomatic ends in view than the Herodotean historiography has reckoned with.

The honours heaped upon the Athenian in Sparta Diodoros 11. 27 (Ephoros) traces to Spartan apprehensions of reprisals on the part of the Athenians and Themistokles, for the set-back after Salamis; they may have been intended, at least in part, to promote a naval policy for the future (cp. c. 108 *supra*), as well as to reward its past success. They do not appear to have turned his head, much less won Themistokles to sacrifice Athenian to Spartan interests. Within a twelvemonth he is in Sparta again, for a very different purpose, and at considerable risk to himself; cp. Thucyd. 1. 89–92. The Themistoklean legend had attempted to discount his services to Athens in Sparta by ignoring the visit after Plataia-Mykale, and caricaturing the visit after Salamis; Thucydides' record is a part of the *Rettung* of Themistokles, which he favours. Cp. Appendix VII. § 4.

9. **Εὐρυβιάδῃ**, who must, according to the antecedent anecdote, have voted the prize to himself at the Isthmos.

σοφίης δὲ καὶ δεξιότητος: the distinction between the 'ethical' (*ἀνδρηίη*, cp. App. Crit.) and the 'intellectual' virtues, and their rewards, shows that the Spartans had some philosophy in them! The award is the same in each case, an olive-wreath; and the co-ordination (which justifies our understanding *ἀριστήια* before *σοφίης*) is emphasized by the words **καὶ τούτῳ** (*et ipsi*; cp. *καὶ οὗτοι* 7. 40, Stein).

11. **ὄχῳ τῷ ἐν Σπάρτῃ καλλιστεύσαντι.** Stein observes the astonishing use here of the aorist. Perhaps when the chariot reached Athens it was not so much thought of!

αἰνέσαντες might seem grammatically to belong to the *τριηκόσιοι*, but *κατὰ*

προέπεμψαν ἀπιόντα τριηκόσιοι Σπαρτιητέων λογάδες, οὗτοι οἵ περ ἱππέες καλέονται, μέχρι οὔρων τῶν Τεγεητικῶν. μοῦνον δὴ τοῦτον πάντων ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν Σπαρτιῆ-
125 *ται προέπεμψαν. ὡς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Λακεδαίμονος ἀπίκετο ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας, ἐνθαῦτα Τιμόδημος Ἀφιδναῖος τῶν ἐχθρῶν μὲν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος ἐών, ἄλλως δὲ οὐ τῶν ἐπιφανέων ἀνδρῶν, φθόνῳ καταμαργέων ἐνείκεε τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα, τὴν ἐς Λακεδαίμονα ἄπιξιν προφέρων, ὡς διὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἔχοι τὰ γέρεα τὰ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίων, ἀλλ' οὐ δι' ἑωυτόν. ὃ δέ, ἐπείτε οὐκ ἐπαύετο λέγων ταῦτα ὁ Τιμόδημος, εἶπε "οὕτω ἔχει τοι· οὔτ'*

12 ἀνιόντα Pz 13 οὔρων B^2z **125.** 2 ἀθηναῖος **B** || μὲν om. **B** 3 ἀνδρῶν om. R 4 καταμαρπτέων **a**Cz (γρ. μαρπτέων P^m) || Θεμιστοκλῆα z || σπάρτην **B** 5 ἔχει z 6 ἑωυτῶν B || ἐνέκειτο καὶ οὐκ .. 7 ταῦτα λέγων z || οὕτως R

σύνεσιν, a reference to the previous subject (*Λακεδαιμόνιοι*) seems more pointed and natural. The *αἶνος* perhaps took the form of songs or orations in his honour; cp. Thuc. 2. 25. 2. It is followed by the 'pomp,' or escort, to the frontier.

12. **τριηκόσιοι Σπαρτιητέων λογάδες**: perhaps the royal body-guard, *οἱ τριακόσιοι ἱππῆς καλούμενοι* Thuc. 5. 72. 4 (but cp. 6. 56, 7. 205 *supra*), apparently identical with the *corps d'élite* of hoplites, described by Xenophon, *Laced. Rep.* 4, as chosen by the three *Hippagretai*, each choosing 100 men, the Hippagretai themselves having been selected by the Ephors; the corps would then be annually recruited, and a fresh levy may have been made since Thermopylai. There were no real riders in the Spartan army of this date, but the title was an interesting survival. Cp. 1. 67, a passage which suggests that the corps of *Hippeis* at Sparta was partially recruited every year, the thirty seniors perhaps taking their discharge (and furnishing the five *Ἀγαθοεργοί*), while thirty juniors would be admitted to the corps, the whole being thus normally renewable every decade. But provision must, of course, have been made for occasional vacancies.

14. **μοῦνον δὴ τοῦτον π. ἀνθ. τ. ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν**: cp. Athenian orator *ap.* Thuc. 1. 74. 1 *καὶ αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς ἐτιμήσατε μάλιστα δὴ ἄνδρα ξένον τῶν ὡς ὑμᾶς ἐλθόντων.* On the Herodotean formula cp. c. 105 *supra*. The *asyndeton* is observable; cp. 9. 35 *μοῦνοι δὲ δὴ πάντων κτλ.*

125. 1. **ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας** seems to assume that the Athenians had reoccupied the city; cp. c. 109 *supra*.

2. **Τιμόδημος Ἀφιδναῖος**: on the deme of Aphidnai cp. 9. 73 *infra*. Pindar composed an Ode (*Nem.* 2) for the victory of Timodemos, son of Timonoos, of Acharnai, in the Pankration, about Ol. 75, a man, too, with a Salaminian connexion (*op. c.* 20), but the only apparent glory of the Aphidnian was that he belonged to the well-defined group of **τῶν ἐχθρῶν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος**. The anecdote is transferred by Plato *Rep.* 329, followed by Plutarch *Them.* 18, to an anonymous Seriphian: had the aristocratic tradition in Athens grown sensitive of the fame of Timodemos?

3. **ἄλλως**, in its simplest meaning.

τῶν ἐπιφανέων: the word appears used in a party sense in [Aristot.] *Ἀθ. πολ.* 28 *τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανῶν προειστήκει Νικίας*, but in an entirely unpolitical sense in Thuc. 2. 43. 3 (*ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος*). The meaning here is between the two; cp. 2. 89, 172.

4. **φθόνῳ** here appears in its proper place as the characteristic Republican vice; cp. c. 124 *supra*. The man here is mad with it. **καταμαργέων**: cp. 6. 75 (*ὑπέλαβε μανίη νοῦσος ἐόντα καὶ πρότερον ὑπομαργότερον* of Kleomenes).

5. **προφέρων**: *obiciens*, *exprobrans*; cp. c. 61 *supra*. The participles *καταμαργέων* and *προφέρων* are piled on without copula (*Asyndeta*).

τὰ γέρεα: to wit, the Olive-wreath, the Chariot, the Encomium, and the Escort, enumerated in the previous chapter.

ἂν ἐγὼ ἐὼν Βελβινίτης ἐτιμήθην οὕτω πρὸς Σπαρτιητέων, οὔτ' ἂν σὺ ὤνθρωπε ἐὼν 'Αθηναῖος.” ταῦτα μέν νυν ἐς τοσοῦτο ἐγένετο.

'Αρτάβαζος δὲ ὁ Φαρνάκεος ἀνὴρ ἐν Πέρσῃσι λόγιμος 126
καὶ πρόσθε ἐών, ἐκ δὲ τῶν Πλαταιικῶν καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτι γενόμενος, ἔχων ἓξ μυριάδας στρατοῦ τοῦ Μαρδόνιος ἐξελέξατο, προέπεμπε βασιλέα μέχρι τοῦ πόρου. ὡς δὲ ὁ μὲν ἦν ἐν τῇ

---

8 *καὶ ἐὼν* Valla (*etiam si*) || *πρὸ* A[1] || *οὔτε σὺ* **B** 9 *νυν* om. **a**C || *τοσοῦτον* B*z* 126. 2 *πρόσθεν* **B***z* || *γενησόμενος*? van H. 3 *τοῦ* : *ὃν* *z* 4 *βασιλῆα* *z* || *ἦν* om. **a**C

---

8. **ἐὼν Βελβινίτης . . ἐὼν 'Αθηναῖος.** The *Βέλβινα* here referred to is no doubt the small island of that name (Strabo 375, 398), identified with St. George (*San Giorgio d' Arbore*) about 12 m. due S. of Sunion. It appears once on the Athenian tribute-lists (*C.I.A.* 37, i.e. *τάξις φόρου* of 425 B.C.) with an assessment of 300 drachmai: perhaps a gross imposition. The first *ἐών* is obviously hypothetical: why not the second too? In which case the retort of Themistokles has the added sting of insinuating *ξενία* against this *ἄνθρωπος*.

9. **ἐς τοσοῦτο**, 'no further'; cp. 5. 50.

126. 1. **'Αρτάβαζος δὲ ὁ Φαρνάκεος** has been already mentioned, 7. 66, as commander (*ἄρχων*) of the Parthians and Chorasmians. He has not been mentioned above, in the story of the return of Xerxes (cc. 115–17), where his presence is urgently called for. The omission points to the mutual independence of the various sources employed by Hdt., and also to his failure to fuse them into a consistent whole; cp. Introduction, § 10. The story here told of Artabazos reduces even the comparatively unexaggerated record of the 'flight' of Xerxes given by Hdt. above to an absurdity. Stein remarks that Hdt. speaks with such transparent good-will and such special knowledge of Artabazos that we may infer personal relations between the historian and the man's family, or even the man himself. Artabazos became satrap of Daskyleion in 476 B.C. in order to further the treason of Pausanias, Thuc. 1. 129. 1. Pharnakes, son of Pharnabazos (Thuc. 2. 67. 1), plainly a near relative, is found there 431–414 B.C., and was in turn succeeded by his own son, Pharnabazos, 413–388 B.C. (Thuc. 8. 6. 1). An Artabazos appears again in possession of the same satrapy (360–53 B.C.); cp. Krumbholz, *de Asiae min. Satrapis* (1883), p. 73. Stein regards Tritantaichmes, son of 'Artabazos,' the satrap of Babylon (1. 192), as another of his sons (but cp. notes to 7. 82, 121 *supra*), and apparently thinks that Hdt. found him as satrap in Babylon. (But Hdt.'s visit to Babylon has still to be proved.) Cp. further, 9. 89.

2. **ἐκ δὲ τῶν Πλαταιικῶν καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτι γενόμενος**: a clear anticipation of the story in Bk. 9. 41, etc. The participle, *γενόμενος*, is used from the writer's point of view, and date. Hdt. throughout treats the main events as notorious; but in the **πρόσθε ἐών** just before the reference is to the date of the events in the narrative, and might lead us to expect *γενησόμενος*. How *τὰ Πλαταιικά* could redound to the credit of Artabazos is not obvious in the narrative of those events, even with this *praeiudicium* to guide us.

3. **ἔχων ἓξ μυριάδας στρατοῦ τοῦ Μ. ἐξελέξατο**: that would be, strictly speaking, one-fifth of the army of Mardonios. He presumably had some cavalry—say, one myriad: that would give him five myriads of infantry. If the army of Mardonios (Xerxes?) numbered all told nominally 300,000, it may have been composed of five divisions, each comprising 50,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry—Artabazos being the commander of one of these divisions. In Bk. 9, indeed, Artabazos appears as almost of co-ordinate authority with Mardonios. If that was the true state of the case, their total forces combined may but have amounted to 120,000 men (nominal). Cp. further, Appendix II. § 5.

4. **τοῦ πόρου**: cp. c. 115 *supra*. The story, of course, conflicts directly with both the stories previously told and discussed (cc. 115–17, 118–20), and is more moderate than either.

Ἀσίῃ, ὃ δὲ ὀπίσω πορευόμενος κατὰ τὴν Παλλήνην ἐγίνετο, ἅτε Μαρδονίου τε χειμερίζοντος περὶ Θεσσαλίην τε καὶ Μακεδονίην καὶ οὐδέν κω κατεπείγοντος ἥκειν ἐς τὸ ἄλλο στρατόπεδον, οὐκ ἐδικαίου ἐντυχὼν ἀπεστεῶσι Ποτειδαιήτῃσι μὴ οὐκ ἐξανδραποδίσασθαι σφέας. οἱ γὰρ Ποτειδαιῆται, ὡς βασιλεὺς παρεξεληλάκεε καὶ ὁ ναυτικὸς τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι οἰχώκεε φεύγων ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος, ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ ἀπέστασαν ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων·
127 ὣς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ τὴν Παλλήνην ἔχοντες. ἐνθαῦτα δὴ Ἀρτάβαζος ἐπολιόρκεε τὴν Ποτείδαιαν. ὑποπτεύσας δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ὀλυνθίους ἀπίστασθαι ἀπὸ βασιλέος, καὶ ταύτην ἐπο-

5 ἐγένετο *z* 8 Ποτειδαιήτῃσι van H., Stein[3]: Ποτιδαιήτῃσι Stein[1 2], Holder (et sic passim) 11 ἐκ τῆς Σαλαμῖνος *z*, van H. || ἀπέστησαν C 12 ὡς ABR*z*: (ὣς van H.) || ὤλλοι **B**: ὧλλοι Holder, van H. 127. 2 ὁ Ἀρτάβαζος C || Ποτείδαιαν van H., Stein[3]: ποτίδαιαν **a**, Stein[1 2], Holder: ποτιδαίην **B***z* 3 βασιλῆος *z*

5. **ὀπίσω πορευόμενος κατὰ τὴν Παλλήνην ἐγίνετο.** Artabazos apparently experiences no difficulty in marching backwards and forwards in Makedonia and Thrace. Is it possible after all that Artabazos did not escort the king to the Hellespont, but simply went from Thessaly to operate against Poteidaia? Or is it even possible that he had been safeguarding the king's route all along, and never was south of Thessaly until he joined Mardonios in the spring of 479 B.C.? On Pallene cp. 7. 123 *supra*.

6. **χειμερίζοντος**: cp. c. 113 *supra*; by this time it was winter. Mardonios' men were partly in **Μακεδονίῃ**.

7. **καὶ οὐδέν κω κατεπείγοντος ἥκειν**, 'Mardonios was not yet pressing his coming . .,' i.e. that Artabazos should join him. *κατεπείγειν* is an *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* in Hdt. *ἐπείγειν* is frequent (e.g. c. 68 *supra, bis*).

8. **οὐκ ἐδικαίου . . μὴ οὐκ ἐξανδραποδίσασθαι σφέας**: a true instance of the idiomatic double negative *μὴ οὐ*: cp. c. 119 *supra*.

10. **παρεξεληλάκεε . . οἰχώκεε**: both verbs are strict temporal pluperfects; but the acts were neither synchronous, nor are they mentioned in the historical order — unless, indeed, the fleet was accompanying the king on his way back (as the apocryphal story in c. 118 *supra* might be held to imply).

12. **ὣς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι . . ἔχοντες.** The revolt of all the towns on Pallene appears as a direct result of the battle of Salamis. As they were the first to disown the Persian yoke, so were they probably among the first to enter the Delian League (cp. Thuc. 5. 18. 5). The proximity of Makedon, and its relations with the Persian, were calculated to stimulate their Hellenic sympathies. The complete absence of any reference in the story of the siege of Poteidaia in 480–79 B.C. which follows, to the siege of Poteidaia in 432 B.C. and the following years (Thucyd. i. 58, etc.), is observable, and makes against the theory that Hdt. was composing these Books for the first time about the time of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war. This story may well belong to the first draft of the work, and he has not inserted into this context any late reference; the latest hint of the final revision of these Books occurs above in 7. 137. Perhaps Hdt. was not aware of the fall of Poteidaia in the winter of 430–29 B.C., Thuc. 2. 70, though he can hardly have been ignorant of the Athenian blockade, and may have avoided express reference to its prolongation out of respect for Athenian susceptibilities. But the *argumentum a silentio* does not carry us very far; cp. Introduction, § 7.

127. 3. **τοὺς Ὀλυνθίους . . καὶ ταύτην**: sc. *τὴν Ὄλυνθον*. Cp. c. 121 *supra* for the reverse process. On Olynthos cp. 7. 122. For the **Βοττιαῖοι** cp. 7. 123, **Θ. κόλπου** 7. 121.

ἀπίστασθαι: imperfect.

λιόρκεε· εἶχον δὲ αὐτὴν Βοττιαῖοι ἐκ τοῦ Θερμαίου κόλπου
ἐξαναστάντες ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων. ἐπεὶ δὲ σφέας εἷλε πολιορκέων,
κατέσφαξε ἐξαγαγὼν ἐς λίμνην, τὴν δὲ πόλιν παραδιδοῖ
Κριτοβούλῳ Τορωναίῳ ἐπιτροπεύειν καὶ τῷ Χαλκιδικῷ γένεϊ,
καὶ οὕτω Ὄλυνθον Χαλκιδέες ἔσχον. ἐξελὼν δὲ ταύτην ὁ 128
Ἀρτάβαζος τῇ Ποτειδαίῃ ἐντεταμένως προσεῖχε· προσέχοντι
δέ οἱ προθύμως συντίθεται προδοσίην Τιμόξεινος ὁ τῶν
Σκιωναίων στρατηγός, ὅντινα μὲν τρόπον ἀρχήν, ἔγωγε οὐκ
ἔχω εἰπεῖν (οὐ γὰρ ὦν λέγεται), τέλος μέντοι τοιάδε ἐγίνετο·
ὅκως βυβλίον γράψειε ἢ Τιμόξεινος ἐθέλων παρὰ Ἀρτάβαζον
πέμψαι ἢ Ἀρτάβαζος παρὰ Τιμόξεινον, τοξεύματος παρὰ τὰς

4 οἱ ἐκ **ß**z, Holder   7 Τορωναίῳ om. **a**C || ἐπιτρέπειν **a**C
128. 3 συνετίθετο z || τιμόξενος **ß**   4 τρόπων Apr.   5 εἶπαι z, van H.   6 βιβλίον Pz || γράψοιεν S (Gaisf.) || τιμόξενος θέλων **ß**
7 τιμόξενον **ß** || παρὰ : περὶ Valckenaer, Gaisford, ex Aenea tact. 31

5. **ἐξαναστάντες ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων,** 'driven out by the Makedonians,' or 'retired before the M.' ὑπό with the neuter, or intrans. verb, cps. with θνήσκειν, ἐκπεσεῖν, etc.

6. **κατέσφαξε . . ἐς λίμνην**: he apparently butchered the inhabitants (Bottiaians) and threw their bodies into the lake, prob. the *Bolyca* Lagoon, a little E. of the city, Leake, *N. Gr.* iii. 155 (ἡ Βολυκὴ λίμνη, Athenaeus). The commentators, however, generally take ἐς λίμνην merely with ἐξαγαγών: if Hdt. had intended that, would he not have placed the words differently? The Persians worshipped rivers, running water, 1. 138.

παραδιδοῖ . . ἐπιτροπεύειν: the first verb is in the historic present—the rather, perhaps, as the result is permanent, and obtains at the time of writing; the second is epexegetical, and refers only to the position of Kritoboulos.

7. **Κριτοβούλῳ Τορωναίῳ . . καὶ τῷ Χαλκιδικῷ γένεϊ.** Nothing more seems known of this Kritoboulos: the name is a common one (cp. 2. 181). Torone (cp. 7. 122) was presumably a colony from Chalkis. The Bottiaioi were not exterminated by this massacre at Olynthos, as they appear in Thucydides again and again, e.g. 1. 58. The great Chalkidic synoikism of Olynthos took place in 432 B.C., Thuc. *l.c.* To it there seems no reference made by Hdt. Olynthos thus appears to have passed through at least three stages of development before the Peloponnesian war: (i.) primitive settlement; (ii.) Bottiaian; (iii.) Chalkidic, in two degrees; in each of which the Chalkidic 'race' is the *protégé* of the foreigner, Persian, Makedonian.

128. 2. **ἐντεταμένως προσεῖχε**: sc. τὸν νοῦν: the adv. from the pass. part. perf. is observable, cp. 7. 53 *supra*. **προθύμως** just below reproduces the sense.

3. **Τιμόξεινος ὁ τῶν Σκιωναίων στρατηγός.** The name (Timoxenos) is common, but this Skionaian is only mentioned again by Polyainos, 7. 33. 1, in reproducing this very anecdote. On Skione cp. 7. 123 *supra*. The towns on Pallene had not merely all revolted (c. 126 *supra ad f.*) but were all in alliance; cp. *infra* παρῆν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Παλληναίων συμμαχίη.

4. **ἀρχὴν . . τέλος**: both words are adverbial; *ab initio . . ad extremum.* The correspondence of **μέν** and **μέντοι** is *en règle*; cp. Madvig § 254.

ἔγωγε οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν (οὐ γὰρ ὦν λέγεται): both statements are genuine Herodotus, he never deliberately invents; but neither implies that he had made inquiries *in loco*: his source might be literary.

6. **ὅκως . . γράψειε**, opt. of indefinite frequency; cp. c. 52 *supra*. It is not likely that any of these interesting documents were preserved, much less that Hdt. had seen them.

7. **τοξεύματος παρὰ τὰς γλυφίδας**: τόξευμα of the arrow itself, as in 4. 132 (τῶνδε τῶν τοξευμάτων = διστοὺς πέντε c. 131). The γλυφίδες have been variously interpreted: (i.) of "the notched end of

γλυφίδας περιειλίξαντες καὶ πτερώσαντες τὸ βυβλίον ἐτόξευον ἐς συγκείμενον χωρίον. ἐπάιστος δὲ ἐγένετο ὁ Τιμόξεινος προδιδοὺς τὴν Ποτείδαιαν· τοξεύων γὰρ ὁ Ἀρτάβαζος ἐς τὸ συγκείμενον, ἁμαρτὼν τοῦ χωρίου τούτου βάλλει ἀνδρὸς Ποτειδαιήτεω τὸν ὦμον, τὸν δὲ βληθέντα περιέδραμε ὅμιλος, οἷα φιλέει γίνεσθαι ἐν πολέμῳ, οἳ αὐτίκα τὸ τόξευμα λαβόντες ὡς ἔμαθον τὸ βυβλίον, ἔφερον ἐπὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς· παρῆν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Παλληναίων συμμαχίη. τοῖσι δὲ στρατηγοῖσι ἐπιλεξαμένοισι τὸ βυβλίον καὶ μαθοῦσι τὸν αἴτιον τῆς προδοσίης ἔδοξε μὴ καταπλῆξαι Τιμόξεινον προδοσίῃ τῆς Σκιωναίων πόλιος εἵνεκα, μὴ νομιζοίατο εἶναι Σκιωναῖοι ἐς
129 *τὸν μετέπειτα χρόνον αἰεὶ προδόται. ὃ μὲν δὴ τοιούτῳ τρόπῳ ἐπάιστος ἐγεγόνεε· Ἀρταβάζῳ δὲ ἐπειδὴ πολιορκέοντι ἐνεγε-*

---

8 *γλαφίδας* R || *βιβλίον* Pz 9 *ἐγίνετο* **a**C || *τιμόξενος* **B** 10 *Ποτείδαιαν* van H., Stein[3] || *ὁ* om. **B** 12 *Ποτειδαιήτεω* van H., Stein[3] 14 *βιβλίον* Pz || *παρῆσαν* A (= M), Gronovius 15 *συμμαχίηι* B 16 *βιβλίον* Pz || *μαθοῦσα* R || *τὸ αἴτιον* S (Gaisf.), Marc. 17 *καταπλέξαι τιμόξενον* **B** **129.** 2 *ἐγένετο* Pz

---

an arrow-shaft," i.e. notched for the bow-string (but why, then, the plural? idiomatic, perhaps: besides, you would make the notch with two cuts). (ii.) Stein understands notches (*Kerben*) cut in the arrow for the first and second fingers to draw; but such notches are superfluous. (iii.) Schweighaeuser suggests four notches, or slits for the insertion of the feathers: four is too many (Eurip. *Orest.* 273 f. is not conclusive: *οὐχ ὁρᾶθ' ἐκηβόλων Τόξων πτερωτὰς γλυφίδας ἐξορμωμένας;* much less *Od.* 21. 419): L. & S. seem to approve. (iv.) Blakesley boldly understands 'barbs,' rather topsy-turvily; it is clearly the upper end of the arrow that is referred to, and *γλυφίδες* could scarcely mean the (notched) barb: arrows were not always barbed, and barbs were not always notched.

13. **οἷα φιλέει γίνεσθαι ἐν πολέμῳ.** Had Hdt. seen any fighting, or is this graphic touch from his literary source? **ὅμιλος . . οἳ** is *κατὰ σύνεσιν.*

14. **ἔμαθον**, 'perceived'—they did not all, or any, read it. (Cp. **ἐπιλεξαμένοισι** below.)

τοὺς στρατηγούς: of the Poteidaiatai? or of the allies generally? In the latter case Timoxenos himself would have been included. If by reading the document they were able to detect the traitor, it must have been written in Greek and addressed to him (*Ἀρτάβαζος Τιμοξείνῳ*): a gratuitous imprudence.

15. **συμμαχίη** = *σύμμαχοι*, abstract for concrete. The list would comprise Aphytis, Neapolis, Aige, Therambos, Skione, Mende, Sane; cp. 7. 123 *supra.*

17. **ἔδοξε μὴ καταπλῆξαι Τ. προδοσίῃ**: a formal resolution of the Council of War: **προδοσίῃ** *proditione*, i.e. *proditionis crimine*; *καταπλῆξαι*, if it is to stand (cp. App. Crit.), 'to dumb-founder.' *καταπλέξαι* would be 'to involve,' entwist; but the meaning, c. 83 *supra*, is not parallel.

τῆς Σκιωναίων πόλιος εἵνεκα: a strange degree of consideration! Timoxenos must have been all-powerful in Skione, and Skione in the peninsula. In 423 B.C. Skione revolted from Athens, after the conclusion of the Twelvemonths' Truce (Thuc. 4. 120), for which revolt it afterwards dearly paid (Thuc. 5. 32. 1); but there appears to be no reference whatever in Hdt. to those later events.

129. 2. ἐγεγόνεε . . ἐνεγόνεσαν: the tense does not seem of much importance in either case, but has its full temporal value at least in the second; the 'unconscious iteration,' duplicated by *γίνεται* and *γενόμενον*, all within four lines, marks a certain poverty of style. The three months' siege of Poteidaia will have filled the winter of 480–79 B.C.

γόνεσαν τρεῖς μῆνες, γίνεται ἄμπωτις τῆς θαλάσσης μεγάλη καὶ χρόνον ἐπὶ πολλόν. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βάρβαροι τέναγος γενόμενον παρήισαν ἐς τὴν Παλλήνην. ὡς δὲ τὰς δύο μὲν μοίρας διοδοιπορήκεσαν, ἔτι δὲ τρεῖς ὑπόλοιποι ἦσαν, τὰς διελθόντας χρῆν εἶναι ἔσω ἐν τῇ Παλλήνῃ, ἐπῆλθε πλημμυρὶς τῆς θαλάσσης μεγάλη, ὅση οὐδαμά κω, ὡς οἱ ἐπιχώριοι λέγουσι, πολλάκις γινομένη. οἱ μὲν δὴ νέειν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπιστάμενοι διεφθείροντο, τοὺς δὲ ἐπισταμένους οἱ Ποτειδαιῆται ἐπιπλώσαντες πλοίοισι ἀπώλεσαν. αἴτιον δὲ λέγουσι Ποτειδαιῆται τῆς τε ῥηχίης [καὶ τῆς πλημμυρίδος] καὶ τοῦ Περσικοῦ πάθεος γενέσθαι τόδε, ὅτι τοῦ Ποσειδέωνος ἐς τὸν νηὸν καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ ἠσέβησαν οὗτοι τῶν Περσέων οἵ περ καὶ διεφθάρησαν ὑπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης· αἴτιον δὲ τοῦτο

5 *παρῆσαν* codd.: *παρίεσαν* z || *μὲν δύο* **ß**, Holder 6 *διωδοιπορήκεσαν* Pz || *ἔσαν* z 7 *ἔσω εἶναι* **ß**z, Holder 8 *ὅσην* **ß** || *ὡς* om. S 9 *γενομένης* RS: (*γινομένης* V): *γενομένη* z || *αὐτέων* z 10 *δ'* **α**, van H. || *οἱ* om. **ß**Pz, Holder, van H. || *Ποτειδαιῆται* (bis) van H., Stein[3]: *ποτιδαιῆται* (*ποτιδεῆται* V) 12 *καὶ τῆς πλημμυρίδος* del. Valckenaer, Stein[2], Holder, van H. 13 *ἐς* post *ὅτι* **ß** || *νεὸν* B 14 *τὸ ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ* om. **ß** || *ἐσέβησαν* AB 15 *τοίπερ* z

3. **ἄμπωτις**, 'ebb,' cp. 7. 198 *supra.* The words **χρόνον ἐπὶ πολλόν** are vague; it is impossible to say whether Hdt. means a matter of hours, or of days.

5. **τὰς δύο μέν κτλ.**, a curious particularity: at any rate, they had not got quite half-way. **ὑπόλοιποι**, cp. 7. 171 and *ὑπολειφθέντες* c. 67 *supra.*

7. **πλημμυρίς**, 'flood,' flood-tide: the reverse of *ἄμπωτις* just above; this was the largest on record, or in memory. The reference, however, in **πολλάκις γινομένη** cannot be to normal tidal phenomena such as he has recorded in 7. 198. This passage and that, from different sources, are apparently written without reference to each other. But Hdt. can hardly be taken in this passage to be referring to the great tidal disturbances recorded in Thuc. 3. 89. 2 ff. for the summer of 426 B.C. He has not been working at his composition so late as that; cp. Introduction, § 9.

8. **ὡς οἱ ἐπιχώριοι λέγουσι**: the authority (not necessary *viva voce*) is adduced for a statement which Hdt. merely gives 'for what it is worth'; so, too, just below, **αἴτιον δὲ λέγουσι Ποτειδαιῆται.** These citations of sources do not, and are not intended to, guarantee the statements, much less to show that Hdt. has cross-questioned the natives. Cp. Introduction, § 10. *αἴτιον* is used here in a less physical sense than in 7. 125 *supra.*

12. **ῥηχίης** is plainly identical with *πλημμυρίδος* (cp. 2. 11, 7. 198).

15. **αἴτιον δὲ τοῦτο λέγοντες εὖ λέγειν ἔμοιγε δοκέουσι.** If just the very 'Persians' (were they all Persians?), neither more nor fewer, who perished, had been guilty of the sacrilege in the temple of Poseidon, the coincidence would, indeed, have been remarkable: but was not the guilt to some extent inferred from the doom, on the well-established canon which condemned the Galileans on whom the tower in Siloam fell as sinners above all Galileans? Hdt. is less of a critic in this passage than in his rationale of Poseidonian action at Tempe, 7. 129 *supra.* Perhaps the direct intervention of the deity was more intelligible to him, in a case of human *ἀσέβεια*, than in the case of a natural object. Hdt. does not indeed here actually specify the personal action of the outraged god; but he must be supposed to have taken it for self-evident, between the *ἀσέβεια* and the *ῥηχίη*. Poteidaia is, of course, a city of Poseidon: Poseidon Hippios appears on its coinage,

λέγοντες εὖ λέγειν ἔμοιγε δοκέουσι. τοὺς δὲ περιγενομένους ἀπῆγε Ἀρτάβαζος ἐς Θεσσαλίην παρὰ Μαρδόνιον. οὗτοι μὲν οἱ προπέμψαντες βασιλέα οὕτω ἔπρηξαν.

130 *Ὁ δὲ ναυτικὸς ὁ Ξέρξεω περιγενόμενος ὡς προσέμειξε τῇ Ἀσίῃ φεύγων ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος καὶ βασιλέα τε καὶ τὴν στρατιὴν ἐκ Χερσονήσου διεπόρθμευσε ἐς Ἄβυδον, ἐχειμέριζε ἐν Κύμῃ. ἔαρος δὲ ἐπιλάμψαντος πρώιος συνελέγετο ἐς Σάμον· αἱ δὲ τῶν νεῶν καὶ ἐχειμέρισαν αὐτοῦ· Περσέων δὲ καὶ Μήδων οἱ πλεῦνες ἐπεβάτευον. στρατηγοὶ δέ σφι ἐπῆλθον Μαρδόντης*

---

16 *ἐμοὶ* S 18 *βασιλῆα* z || *οὕτω ἔπρηξαν* om. **a** **130.** 1 *ναυτικὸς στρατὸς* z || *ὁ περιγενόμενος* Krueger, van H.: *στρατὸς ὁ περιγενόμενος* Štourač, cf. Bursian *J.b.* 86. 54 || *προσέμειξε* van H., Stein[3]: *προσέμιξε* 2 *βασιλῆα* z || *τε* om. **B** 3 *χερρονήσου* **B**: *χερονήσου* C || *διεπόρθμευεν* **B** || *ἐχειμέρισε* Pz 4 *δ'* **a**, van H. || *πρῶτον* **B** 5 *νηῶν* **B**z 6 *καὶ στρατηγοὶ* S || *δὲ ἐπῆλθόν σφι* C || *μαρδόνης* Marc.

---

and Head (*Hist. Num.* p. 188) regards the type of the tetradrachm as "doubtless suggested by the sacred image of Poseidon, which Herodotus mentions as standing in front of the city, *ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ.*" The city itself appears to have been situate astride the isthmus, fortified north and south by two parallel walls, and protected east and west by the sea. The object of the Persians was to enter the city round the sea end of the wall (just as Aristeus did in 432 B.C., Thuc. 1. 53). Stein's idea that Poteidaia was not fortified on the S. side appears to arise from a misinterpretation of the words in Thuc. 1. 54. 2 *τὸ δ' ἐς τὴν Παλλήνην ἀτείχιστον ἦν*, which refer to the absence of Athenian siege-works on the south side. As a matter of fact the Athenians had demanded the dismantling of the south wall, *τὸ ἐς Παλλήνην τεῖχος* Thuc. 1. 54. 2, a demand compliance with which would have placed the town at the mercy of the sea-power.

16. **τοὺς περιγενομένους**: he has 40,000 men in 9. 66 *infra* against 60,000 in c. 126 *supra*.

130. 1. **ὁ δὲ ναυτικὸς ὁ Ξέρξεω**: the narrative shifts to the Persian navy, cp. c. 117 *supra*. *στρατός* is omitted, cp. next c. l. 3. The article is repeated as in 7. 196, and often; contr. 7. 124 etc.

3. **ἐχειμέριζε ἐν Κύμῃ.** On Kyme cp. 7. 194 *supra*. The position was well chosen, in relation to Sardes, to the northern portion of Ionia and Aiolis, and to the Hellespont. It appears, however, immediately that some of the vessels had wintered at Samos: had these not been to the Hellespont, after Salamis? It is remarkable that Samos, not Kyme, is the rendezvous in the spring. *χειμερίζειν*, cp. c. 113 *supra*. **ἐπιλάμψαντος** = *ἀρχομένου*, a metaphor from the day transferred to the year (Sitzler). **πρώιος** keeps up the metaphor (Stein). **αὐτοῦ**, the adv. of place, 'on the spot.'

5. **Περσέων δὲ καὶ Μήδων οἱ πλεῦνες ἐπεβάτευον.** The literal meaning of these words is: 'Of Persians and Medes the majority were *Epibatai.*' Not absolutely, of course, but in relation to the Strategoi. This appears to give a very poor antithesis. 'Of Persians and Medes, serving on the fleet, very few were other than *Epibatai.*' But perhaps Hdt. meant to say that on the fleet the majority of *Epibatai* were Medes and Persians: 'the majority of those serving as *Epibatai* were of Persians and Medes,' *οἱ πλεῦνες* being the predicate: the genitive remains problematic. He can hardly mean that the majority of the Medo-Persian *Epibatai* originally mentioned (7. 96) were still serving on board: the allusion would be far-fetched. In any case the expression is wanting in style and lucidity.

6. **στρατηγοὶ δέ.** There are three new admirals, or commanders, for a fleet of 300; but it appears afterwards that one of the three (Mardontes) is in command of the *Epibatai*, and the other two in command of the fleet; cp. 9. 102.

τε ὁ Βαγαίου καὶ Ἀρταΰντης ὁ Ἀρταχαίεω· συνῆρχε δὲ τούτοισι καὶ ἀδελφιδέος αὐτοῦ Ἀρταΰντεω προσελομένου Ἰθαμίτρης. ἅτε δὲ μεγάλως πληγέντες, οὐ προήισαν ἀνωτέρω τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης, οὐδ' ἐπηνάγκαζε οὐδείς, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ κατήμενοι ἐφύλασσον τὴν Ἰωνίην μὴ ἀποστῇ, νέας ἔχοντες σὺν τῇσι Ἰάσι τριηκοσίας. οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ προσεδέκοντο τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐλεύσεσθαι ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην ἀλλ' ἀποχρήσειν σφι τὴν ἑωυτῶν φυλάσσειν, σταθμεύμενοι ὅτι σφέας οὐκ ἐπεδίωξαν φεύγοντας ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἀλλ' ἅσμενοι ἀπαλλάσσοντο. κατὰ μέν νυν τὴν θάλασσαν ἑσσωμένοι ἦσαν τῷ θυμῷ, πεζῇ δὲ

7 ἀρταβύτης ibid.: ἀρταΰτης C || Ἀρταχαίεω Stein, van H.: ἀρταχαίου 8 τοῖσδε **a**C, Stein[1] || ἀρταΰντεωι B: ἀρταΰτεω C: ἀρταβύτεω Marc. || προελομένου **B** 9 Ἰθαμίτρης Wesseling: ὁ ἀμΐτηρ R: ὁ ἀμίτρης ceteri || προῄισαν **a**: προήεσαν **B**P: προσῆσαν C: προΐεσαν z || ἀνωτέρωι **a**P 10 τὸ: τὰ **B**Pz || οὐδὲ εἷς **B**, Holder ('forsan recte' van H.) 11 νῆας **B**z 12 μὴν **a**C, Holder 13 προσελεύσεσθαι z: πλεύσεσθαι? Stein[2] || τὴν om. **B** 14 ὅτί σφεας A 15 φεύγοντες C 16 ἑσσώμενοι ἔσαν z

Μαρδόντης τε ὁ Βαγαίου has appeared already as *ἄρχων τῶν νησιωτέων τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἐρυθρῆς θαλάσσης* 7. 80 *supra*. He might know something of sea-faring, but, as a matter of fact, commands the men-at-arms; cp. previous note.

7. **Ἀρταΰντης ὁ Ἀρταχαίεω**: the Artachaies, no doubt, who was an Achaimenid giant, with a colossal voice, and had been one of the Commandants of the Canal (cp. 7. 22, 117). One Otaspes, brother of Artayntes, had apparently been *ἄρχων* of the Assyrians, 7. 63 *supra*.

9. **Ἰθαμίτρης** was presumably son of the Otaspes just referred to. The *ἄρχων* of the *Πάκτυες*, however, was one *Ἀρταΰντης ὁ Ἰθαμίτρεω*, 7. 67 *supra*.

μεγάλως πληγέντες: at Salamis; the expression need not be restricted to the Strategoi. **ἀνωτέρω τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης** seems to be used as an 'orientation' simply from the point of view of the narrative, or *dramatis personae*, and can hardly be cited as proof that Hdt. composed this part of his narrative in Asia.

10. **ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ κατήμενοι ἐφύλασσον.** Samos was probably the best basis of naval operations against an Ionia in revolt, as the Athenians discover in 412 B.C. But the Persians in 479 B.C. are in full possession of the *Hinterland* as well, and the prospect of a merely local revolt might well look almost hopeless.

12. **οὐ μὲν οὐδέ**, 'yet also not,' a double negative, the elements of which, simple and composite, do not cancel but confirm each other (Madvig § 209). The opinion here predicated of the Persians proved ill-founded, a strategic miscalculation; if entertained, it was based perhaps more on the presence of Mardonios in Greece than upon the non-pursuit of the previous year; but the conjecture put forward by Hdt. constitutes a justification of the project of Themistokles (c. 108 *supra*), and condemns *pro tanto* the failure of the Greeks to follow up their victory. The Persian reflexion takes no account of the pursuit as far as Andros.

14. **σταθμεύμενοι**: the form *σταθμώμενος* occurs 7. 237 *supra*; *σταθμεόμενοι* is found 2. 150. Are we to conclude that Hdt. used three different forms of one participle? Or that the MSS. variants are responsible for the discrepancies? *σταθμάομαι, σταθμέομαι, σταθμώομαι* are all possible *Ionica* (cp. L. & S. *sub vv.*, and Weir Smyth § 688, p. 570).

15. **ἀπαλλάσσοντο**: middle (even the active is used intransitively).

16. **ἑσσωμένοι ἦσαν**: the imperfect final verb here is as important as the perfect participle for describing their condition, and the combination, so far from resulting in a *plusquam perfectum*, as a thing of the past, denotes an enduring state of things, or rather of

ἐδόκεον πολλῷ κρατήσειν τὸν Μαρδόνιον. ἐόντες δὲ ἐν Σάμῳ ἅμα μὲν ἐβουλεύοντο εἴ τι δυναίατο κακὸν τοὺς πολεμίους ποιέειν, ἅμα δὲ καὶ ὠτακούστεον ὅκῃ πεσέεται τὰ Μαρδονίου πρήγματα.

131 *Τοὺς δὲ Ἕλληνας τό τε ἔαρ γινόμενον ἤγειρε καὶ Μαρδόνιος ἐν Θεσσαλίῃ ἐών. ὁ μὲν δὴ πεζὸς οὔκω συνελέγετο, ὁ δὲ ναυτικὸς ἀπίκετο ἐς Αἴγιναν, νέες ἀριθμὸν δέκα καὶ ἑκατόν. στρατηγὸς δὲ καὶ ναύαρχος ἦν Λευτυχίδης ὁ Μενάρεος τοῦ Ἡγησίλεω τοῦ Ἱπποκρατίδεω τοῦ Λευτυχίδεω*

17 *πολλὸν* **B** 18 *ἐβουλεύσαντο* B || *δυνέατο* Marc.: *δύναιντο* z 19 *καὶ* om. BSV || *ὅκηι* A : *ὅση* C : *ὅκῃ* ceteri **131.** 1 *γενόμενον* **B**Pz 2 *ὅκου* C 3 *νῆες* **aB**z 4 *λεωτυχιδης* A[m] (bis) 5 *μενάριος* C || *ἡσίλεω* **B**

feelings: no doubt in this case **τῷ θυμῷ** helps materially to establish the true aspect of the verb. They had no stomach for fighting at sea: at the same time they are described as planning at Samos how they may injure the enemy—a fruitless quest, if they were not prepared to move at sea. The hopes and attention concentrated on Mardonios suggest that the fleet was to be prepared to act, at least on the receipt of good news, and possibly upon the receipt of bad news. Though now far apart, the fortunes and acts of fleet and of army could not be matters of indifference, even strategically, one to the other. Hdt.'s motivations are seldom quite adequate or satisfactory; but in regard to the movements, and even the mind of the naval forces on the Persian side, he probably had access to Ionian sources, both narrative and critical, worth something. Cp. Introduction, § 10.

19. **ὠτακούστεον ὅκῃ πεσέεται**: cp. *καραδοκέοντες . . τῇ πεσέεται* 7. 168 *supra*. The substantive *ὠτακουστής* occurs in Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 11. 7 = 133 B of spies, 'eavesdroppers,' employed by Hieron: the verb is used by Xenophon and others.

131. 1. **τό τε ἔαρ γινόμενον κτλ.**, 'the approach of spring, and the presence of Mardonios in Thessaly' (cp. c. 113 *supra*, 133 *infra*). **ἤγειρε**, *excitabat*: not yet sufficiently, however, to bring an army together; it was only the ships which were under way. Aigina is the port of rendezvous; the fleet is counted at 110; its composition and the provenience of the various contingents are left as matters of inference and conjecture, no less than the respective numbers of Ionian and other vessels in the Persian fleet at Samos, c. 130 *supra*.

4. **στρατηγὸς δὲ καὶ ναύαρχος**, 'commander-in-chief and navarch' (primarily a Spartan title ?). Cp. cc. 2 (*στρατηγός*) and 42 (*ναύαρχος*). The investment of a king with the 'navarchy' is remarkable: barring Pausanias, the Regent, such a commission is unparalleled in the fifth century B.C. After the *ὕβρις* of Pausanias (c. 3 *supra*) there is a long interval to the appointment of Agesilaos in 395–94 B.C., Xenoph. *Hell.* 3. 4. 27, and Agesilaos appointed a deputy.

Λευτυχίδης: Leotychidas here introduced with an immense flourish of trumpets is an old acquaintance, as the work now stands; cp. 6. 71 etc. However weak the argument from the patronymic, the two Herakleid pedigrees in these Books must be regarded as good evidence of the earlier composition of Bks. 7–9. It seems very unlikely that Hdt. would have reserved these pedigrees throughout his work for the sake of especially glorifying Leonidas and Leotychidas at the end, the latter of whom had little claim to any special honour. The pedigree of Leotychidas is interesting as proving the distinction between generations and reigns, owing to the especial circumstances of the succession in his case: one has to go back eight generations (inclusive) from Leotychidas to find the king (Theopompos, 13th from Herakles) whose eight ancestors are all kings of Sparta.

5. **Μενάρεος**: Menares (6. 65, 71), the 20th from Herakles, belongs apparently to the same 'generation' as Demaratos

τοῦ Ἀναξίλεω τοῦ Ἀρχιδήμου τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδεω τοῦ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ Νικάνδρου τοῦ Χαρίλεω τοῦ Εὐνόμου τοῦ

7 Χαρίλεω Stein, Holder: χαρίλλου **B**, van H.: χαρίλου || τοῦ ἡρακλέος τοῦ εὐνόμου C

the son of Ariston, whose complete pedigree is recoverable from Pausanias, 3. 7, and the antecedent names in the two Eurypontid pedigrees run back in pairs, neck and neck, to Theopompos.

Ἡγησίλεω: this Hegesileos (Agesilas, Agesilaos) appears in 6. 65 *supra* as Agis, which may be regarded as the hypokoristic, or diminutive, but shows the independence of Hdt.'s sources, and how little he is at pains to harmonize them. This Agesilas is 19th from Herakles, and corresponds with Ariston in the pedigree of Damaratos (7. 3 *supra*, etc.).

Ἱπποκρατίδεω. An Hippokratidas is credited in Plutarch (*Mor.* 222) with a couple of apophthegms, but as one is addressed to a satrap of Karia, its author can hardly be this man. Names compounded with ἱππο- are not common in Sparta, where ἱπποτροφία was comparatively rare; cp. c. 124 *supra*. Hippokratidas, as 18th from Herakles, ranges with Agesikles in the parallel pedigree.

Λευτυχίδεω: Leotychidas ὁ πρῶτος is distinguished by Plutarch (*Mor.* 224) from Leotychidas son of Ariston (*sic*), and credited with four smart apophthegms (on Opportunism, Economics, Education, Sobriety). Leotychidas is 17th from Herakles, ranging with Archidamos I. (On the form of the name Λευ- = Λεω- [Λα-?] cp. Weir Smyth, § 287, p. 254.)

6. **Ἀναξίλεω.** This Anaxilas, the 16th from Herakles (= Anaxidamos in the parallel line), may be the author of the apophthegm preserved in Plutarch *Mor.* 217 on the Ephoralty, and might just possibly be identified with the man who sat in judgement on the Atheno-Megarean question, Plutarch *Solon* 10. The name was not common at Sparta, and was never borne by a king; the Anaxilaos of Xenoph. *Hell.* 1. 3. 19 is Βυζάντιος καὶ οὐ Λακεδαιμόνιος.

Ἀρχιδήμου. Archidamos, the 15th from Herakles in the pedigree of Menares (= Zeuxidamos in the parallel list), bears a name which was not uncommon in the reigning house of Eurypontids (Prokleids), though never borne by an Agid (Eurysthenid) king. Thus this grandson of Theopompos may have been named from his uncle (through whom the sceptre descended), and no less than five kings in all bore the name, of whom the best known was Hdt.'s contemporary, who succeeded Leotychidas.

Ἀναξανδρίδεω: the name Anaxandridas is familiar as that of the (15th) Agid king, son of Leon, and father of Kleomenes, as of Dorieus, Leonidas, and Kleombrotos; cp. 7. 204 *supra*. This Anaxandridas, 14th in descent from Herakles, is not otherwise known to fame than as the founder of the cadet branch of the Eurypontids (Prokleids). His name corresponds with that of his brother Archidamos in the now elder branch of the House. This Archidamos was never king; Theopompos was succeeded by his grandson Zeuxidamos (Pausan. 3. 7. 5). It is rather odd that the Eurypontid (Prokleid) succession in the eighth century B.C. should thus anticipate, with so nice a difference, the succession in the fifth century B.C., when Zeuxidamos, son of Leotychidas, predeceased his father, leaving an Archidamos to succeed; cp. 6. 71 *supra*; the story preserved in Pausanias looks like fiction modelled on the facts of the fifth century. The Eurypontid line of kings would seem to be longer-lived, or longer-reigned, than the Agid, for Leotychidas is but the 16th king, and in the 16th generation, from Aristodamos, while Leonidas is the 18th king in the elder House; and this discrepancy is rather increased than diminished subsequently; but then the lists of kings, and even the genealogies, are not above suspicion. With Hdt. Leonidas and Leotychidas are in the same generation (21st) from Herakles.

7. **Θεοπόμπου**: on Hdt.'s own showing (see below) Theopompos is the 9th king of Sparta (Aristodamos included), and the 13th generation from Herakles included, corresponding to Teleklos in the pedigree of Leonidas, 7. 204 *supra*. This is the only passage in which the name of this king—of whom later writers have so much to tell us—occurs in the work of Hdt. A great external crisis, the 'first' Messenian war (Pausan. 4.

Πολυδέκτεω τοῦ Πρυτάνιος τοῦ Εὐρυφῶντος τοῦ Προκλέος

8 Πολυδέκτεω Valckenaer: πολυδέκτεος || τοῦ πρυτάνιος om. C || Εὐρυπῶντος Valckenaer, van H., deinde <τοῦ Σόου>, sed vide comment. infra

---

4. 3), and a great internal development, the institution of the Ephors (Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 11. 2 = 1313 A), were dated to his reign. The story of the Messenian wars is virtually a lost chapter in Spartan history to Hdt. (cp. 3. 47, the sole articulate reference in the work): the Ephoralty he expressly ascribes to Lykourgos, 1. 65. The importance of King Theopompos dates apparently from the Delphic researches of the (Agid) King Pausanias early in the fourth century B.C. Cp. Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen*, i. (1892) 211 ff.

Νικάνδρου: Nikandros is 8th king in Sparta and 12th descendant of Herakles (corresponding thereby to Archelaos in the pedigree of Leonidas, 7. 204 *supra*). The later writers have something to say of him: Plutarch *Mor.* 250 records three apophthegms (one of them addressed to an Athenian, and assuredly not earlier than the fifth century); Pausanias 2. 36. 5, 3. 7. 4 associates his name especially with the invasion of Argolis.

Χαρίλεω: Charilaos is 7th king of Sparta, and 11th descendant of Herakles (corresponding thereby to Agesilaos in the pedigree of Leonidas, 7. 204 *supra*). The name appears in the *Politics* of Aristotle in two forms, Χάριλλος (2. 10. 2 = 1271 B) and Χαρίλαος (8. 12. 12 = 1316 A); and later tradition had something to say of him, making him out a 'tyrant,' yet also the nephew and ward of Lykourgos, and associated in his Reforms (Plutarch *Lykourg.* 5). This latter point is in direct conflict with Hdt. 1. 65, where Lykourgos appears associated with the elder House, two (or, as the Greeks would have said, three) generations earlier. Pausanias (2. 36. 5, 3. 7. 3, 4. 4. 3), who gives the father's name as Polydektes (not Eunomos), reversing the Herodotean order, represents Charillos as engaged in war especially with Argos and with Tegea (*ll.c.*), and as taken prisoner by the Tegeatai (8. 5. 6) but liberated after swearing that the Lakedaimonians should never again invade Argolis, an oath soon broken (8. 48. 5). Hdt. can hardly have been acquainted with this story (obviously an Argive tale) when he wrote 1. 66.

Εὐνόμου: Eunomos is 6th king of Sparta and 10th descendant of Herakles, corresponding thereby with Doryssos in the pedigree of Leonidas, 7. 204 *supra*; his name is perhaps suspiciously significant, coming about the time of Lykourgos, and none the less so in view of the Εὐνομία of Tyrtaios (Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 7. 3 = 1306 B), and the fact that Lykourgos was made his son, in the fourth century theory (cp. Plutarch *Lykourg.* 2); but the name is not an uncommon one in the historical period (e.g. Xenoph. *Hell.* 5. 1. 5). More suspicious is the fact that the lists followed by Pausanias reversed the order of the names Eunomos and Polydektes, and that even Pausanias has nothing to tell us of Eunomos but that he was son of Prytanis, and that in his reign, and in his son's, 'the land had rest,' ἐν εἰρήνῃ διετέλεσεν οὖσα ἡ Σπάρτη (3. 7. 2). According to Plutarch (*l.c. supra*) he came to a violent end, being struck down with a cleaver, in the praiseworthy attempt to terminate a brawl.

8. **Πολυδέκτεω**: Polydektes is the 5th king of Sparta and the 9th descendant of Herakles, corresponding thereby with Labotas in the pedigree of Leonidas, 7. 204 *supra*. Curiously enough, the name Polydektes is otherwise only associated with mythical characters, viz. (1) as an epithet of Hades, *Hymn to Demeter*, 9; (2) as king of Seriphos, son of Magnes, brother of Dictys, changed into a stone, Pindar, *Pyth.* 12. 24, Pausan. 1. 22. 7, Arrian, *Anab.* 3. 3. 1 etc.

Πρυτάνιος: Prytanis is the 4th king in Sparta, and the 8th descendant of Herakles: corresponding thereby with Echestratos in the pedigree of Leonidas, 7. 204 *supra*. The name is of course significant, and as a magisterial title (though not apparently in actual use at Sparta) somewhat suspicious; but historical examples of its use as a proper name are forthcoming (the earliest, a Lykian, *Iliad* 5. 678, also a boxer from Kyzikos, Pausan. 5. 21. 3, and others). The statement of Pausan. 3.

τοῦ Ἀριστοδήμου τοῦ Ἀριστομάχου τοῦ Κλεοδαίου τοῦ Ὕλλου τοῦ Ἡρακλέος, ἐὼν τῆς ἑτέρης οἰκίης τῶν βασιλέων. οὗτοι πάντες, πλὴν τῶν ἑπτὰ τῶν μετὰ Λευτυχίδεα πρώτων

11 ἑπτὰ Paulmier: δυῶν (δυῷν z: cum τῶν om. R)

7. 2 that the quarrel between Sparta and Argos began in his reign is worth very little, even if it be not contradicted by the next words, that the Spartans had previously made war on the Kynurians.

τοῦ Εὐρυφῶντος: the aspirate in the word is observable; the usual form is Εὐρυπῶν, for which the variant Εὐρυτίων (a more intelligible proper name) occurs, as in Plutarch *Lykourg.* 2 where Valckenaer's emendation Εὐρυπῶντα (and Εὐρυπωντίδας) is now accepted. (So too in Polyain. 2. 13.) This Eurypon is 3rd king in Sparta, and 7th descendant of Herakles, corresponding thereby with Agis, in the pedigree of Leonidas, 7. 204 *supra*. Pausanias (3. 7. 1) only tells us of him that he attained such glory that the House was called Eurypontidai after him, Προκλεΐδας ἐς ἐκεῖνον καλουμένους. Plutarch *Lykourg.* 2 gives as the reason, ὅτι δοκεῖ πρῶτος Εὐρυπῶν τὸ ἄγαν μοναρχικὸν (*sic*) ἀνεῖναι τῆς βασιλείας, δημαγωγῶν καὶ χαριζόμενος τοῖς πολλοῖς. That speculation might provoke further speculation: was it really Eurypon who established the 'younger' House, or obtained recognition for it, in the constitution of Sparta, the dual royalty only dating from his day? Polyainos (*l.c. supra*) has a strange story of the ruse by which Eurypon obtained possession of the city of Mantineia for the Lakedaimonians, a story which suffers under a double anachronism, in crediting Mantineia with a democracy, and the democracy with surrendering the city to Eurypon.

Stein[2] wished to insert τοῦ Σόου after Εὐρυφῶντος. This project was for the purpose of harmonizing Hdt. with Pausanias and with himself (1. 65, 67), as Stein[5] avers. But in reality it would have the effect of dislocating Hdt. himself, whose pedigrees of the two Houses correspond generation by generation, and king for king, as above shown. Hdt. is plainly of a different opinion to Pausanias, 3. 1. 7, in regard to the correspondences.

Προκλεος: the 2nd king in Sparta (reckoning Aristodemos), the 6th descendant of Herakles, the twin-brother of Eurysthenes, and the apparent, though not the nominal founder, not the Eponym, of the younger House; cp. previous note. With Prokles we pass on to ground already familiar, cp. 6. 52, 4. 147 *supra*. The legend of the twins is, of course, an aetiological fiction. Pausanias has nothing to add to the stories in Hdt., but Polyainos again (1. 10) opposes the 'Herakleid' Prokles to the 'Eurystheids' who were in possession of Sparta, and has him win a victory over them, thanks to his pipers. This sporadic tradition is perhaps the most suggestive, the most historic-looking fossil, in the legendary records of Sparta. The name Prokles is borne by many historical personages, cp. 3. 50 (an Epidaurian), Xenoph. *Hell.* 3. 1. 6 (cp. note to Hdt. 6. 70), 6. 5. 38 (a Phleiasian) etc.

9. **Ἀριστοδήμου**: with this name the dual pedigree, and the dual royalty, cease; Aristodemos is monarch, in or out of Sparta, and 5th descendant of Herakles; cp. note to 7. 204 *supra*. It is possible that Aristodemos is a genuine ancestor in the pedigree of the 'younger,' the true Herakleid, and perhaps Dorian, House: the legend of the Twins has inserted him also as ancestor of the Agid, i.e. Eurysthenid or Eurystheid, House, which was already in possession, and with him his legendary ancestors Kleodaios, Hyllos, Herakles. On these names see further notes to 7. 204 *supra*; and on the still earlier and mythological stages of the pedigree, 6. 53 f.

10. **τῆς ἑτέρης οἰκίης τῶν βασιλέων**: these words appear to contain an implicit reference back to the pedigree of the other House in 7. 204 *supra*. Such references imply the solidarity of these three Books.

11. **πλὴν τῶν ἑπτὰ τῶν μετὰ Λ. πρώτων**: ἑπτά is a certain emendation; cp. App. Crit. Hdt. might seem to have fallen into the vulgarism 'seven first' instead of 'first seven'; but πρώτων is to be taken predicatively with καταλεχθέντων. It is a material inaccuracy to reckon the heroes before Aristodemos as 'kings of Sparta,' unless indeed Hdt. means titular or pretendant; but he should not be charged with reckoning

καταλεχθέντων, οἵ ἄλλοι βασιλέες ἐγένοντο Σπάρτης. Ἀθη-
132 ναίων δὲ ἐστρατήγεε Ξάνθιππος ὁ Ἀρίφρονος. ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο ἐς τὴν Αἴγιναν πᾶσαι αἱ νέες, ἀπίκοντο Ἰώνων ἄγγελοι ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Ἑλλήνων, οἳ καὶ ἐς Σπάρτην ὀλίγῳ πρότερον τούτων ἀπικόμενοι ἐδέοντο Λακεδαιμονίων ἐλευθεροῦν τὴν Ἰωνίην· τῶν καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ὁ Βασιληίδεω ἦν· οἳ στασιῶται σφίσι γενόμενοι ἐπεβούλευον θάνατον Στράττι τῷ Χίου τυράννῳ, ἐόντες ἀρχὴν ἑπτά· ἐπιβουλεύοντες

12 βασιλῆες z **132.** 2 νῆες z 3 ἐς τὴν z 4 τουτέων z 6 στασιῶται C : στασιῶταί || σφίσι C : σφισι **a***d* : σφι **B**P*z* 7 στάττι **B** : στράττί cum η lit. ult. superscr. C : στράντη Marc.

'Archidemos son of Theopompos,' who predeceased his father, among the *βασιλέες Σπάρτης* (Stein[5]). Hdt. nowhere even mentions him. Cp. note p. 561b *supra.*

13. **Ξάνθιππος ὁ Ἀρίφρονος:** the patronymic, though he has been mentioned 7. 33 *supra*, is not surprising, even if that passage be not of later insertion; cp. 6. 131, 136. Xanthippos was one of the returned exiles, cp. c. 79 *supra*, and may, like Aristeides, have already been elected one of the Strategoi for 480–79 B.C.

132. 2. **Αἴγιναν:** a relatively advanced post, which would have left Salamis exposed, if all the Greek ships had been taken so far; we may reasonably doubt whether Salamis was thus exposed during the reoccupation of Attica. 110 ships would not account even for the Athenian fleet.

Ἰώνων ἄγγελοι = *πρέσβεις* Ἰ. (cp. 7. 1 *supra*): six in number; see below. The genitive is observable; they were apparently all Chians, but they act in the general interest, and with authority, for they demand the liberation of 'Ionia.' The story is curious and probably incomplete.

4. **ὀλίγῳ πρότερον τούτων:** the chronological indication leaves something to be desired, but suggests the winter or spring of 480–79, and even a point after the rendezvous of the fleet at Aigina.

ἐδέοντο: Stein remarks on this as a surprising use of the imperfect; but explains it (in a note on *ἐφέροντο* 1. 66) by two considerations: (*a*) the extremely free use made of the imperfect by Hdt. (*wie wohl kein anderer Autor*), not so much with strict temporal reference, as with regard to the importance or energy of the action; (*b*) and especially in relative or secondary sentences, where it is freely so used without regard to the temporal relation of the verb to the main sentence and its predicate. As a specially characteristic case he cites 5. 21 *καὶ οὗτοι . . διεφθάρησαν . . εἵπετο γάρ κτλ.* (a passage in which immediately afterwards the pl.p. *ἠφάνιστο* occurs); cp. also 7. 195 *ἦγε*, etc.

5. **Ἡρόδοτος ὁ Βασιληίδεω.** Baehr approves Dahlmann's supposition that the author would not have named his namesake unless they had also been relatives; but surely the coincidence in their names (and their fortunes, each opposing the 'tyrannis' in his native place) might be reason enough. Herodotos, son of Basileides, the Chian, is not otherwise known to fame. Baehr, vol. iv. p. 401 ff., has compiled a list of about a score of men bearing the name of Herodotos, the majority late-comers. Cp. also Pape-Benseler. The Chian, and the Theban for whom Pindar wrote *Isthm.* 1, are the only ones contemporary with or prior to our author. (An old Chian inscrip., however, has *Ἀθηναγόρης Ἡροδότου* *C.I.An.* 382, Stein.) Basileides, too, is a not uncommon name attested for Athens, Kos, Rhodes, etc. Pape-Benseler, i. 199 *sub v.*

6. **στασιῶται σφίσι γενόμενοι:** *σφίσι* = *ἀλλήλοις*. Stein takes the phrase as implying that the conspirators came together from various cities (or townships), six or seven of which can just be discovered in Chios; cp. Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* ii. 199 (Chios, Delphinion, Bolissos, Kaukasa, Polichne, Leukonion, 'the Hollows'): but why should not all the cabal have been resident in the capital? For the figure 'seven' there was high precedent; cp. 3. 70.

7. **Στράττι.** A Strattis is named in

δὲ ὡς φανεροὶ ἐγένοντο, ἐξενείκαντος τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν ἑνὸς τῶν μετεχόντων, οὕτω δὴ οἱ λοιποὶ ἓξ ἐόντες ὑπεξέσχον ἐκ τῆς Χίου καὶ ἐς Σπάρτην τε ἀπίκοντο καὶ δὴ καὶ τότε ἐς τὴν Αἴγιναν, τῶν Ἑλλήνων δεόμενοι καταπλῶσαι ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην· οἳ προήγαγον αὐτοὺς μόγις μέχρι Δήλου. τὸ γὰρ προσωτέρω πᾶν δεινὸν ἦν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι οὔτε τῶν χώρων ἐοῦσι ἐμπείροισι, στρατιῆς τε πάντα πλέα ἐδόκεε εἶναι, τὴν

---

8 *ἐγίνοντο* **a**C 9 *οὕτω δή*: *οὗτοι* **B** || *ἓξ ἐόντες* abesse malit van H. 10 *τε* om. **B**Pz 12 *προήγαγον δὲ* sine *οἳ* **B** 13 *προσωτέρωι* **a**: *προτέρω* **B**

---

4. 138 as one of the Ionian 'tyrants' on the Danube in 512 B.C., i.e. 33 years or so before the date here reached: is this the same man, or his descendant? And at what date was the plot actually hatched? **ἀρχήν**, as in c. 128 *supra*.

8. **ἐξενείκαντος τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν**: one of the participants published, or betrayed, the plot; for this meaning of *ἐκφέρειν* cp. 3. 71, 74.

9. **ὑπεξέσχον**, as in 5. 72, 'made their way out secretly.'

10. **καὶ δὴ καί**, a phrase perhaps not so common in these Books; cp. c. 134. 4.

τότε seems to separate somewhat the visit to Aigina from the visit to Sparta; otherwise it might be supposed that they had been referred by the home government to the King Navarch at Aigina.

12. **προήγαγον αὐτοὺς μόγις μέχρι Δήλου**, 'with difficulty the Ionian ambassadors persuaded the Hellenic admirals to move forwards as far as Delos.' There follows the motivation, or rationale, of this reluctance in the form of two reasons: first, ignorance of the topography, a point further emphasized by the remark upon Samos and the pillars of Herakles; and secondly, apprehension of encountering resistance, that is, of course, in the shape of the Persian fleet. Hdt. does not suggest that the naval movements were in any degree dependent on the operations of Mardonios and the Persian forces behind them in Greece. In his scheme of presenting the facts Mardonios has not yet been brought into Central Greece, but is wintering in Thessaly. Literary methods here help to obscure the real sequence and nexus of events.

14. **τὴν δὲ Σάμον ἐπιστέατο δόξῃ καὶ Ἡρακλέας στήλας ἴσον ἀπέχειν.** At Delos they were considerably more than half-way from Aigina to Samos. This is the only passage in these Books in which 'the Herakleian Pillars' are mentioned: indeed, save for the mention of them in 2. 33, they are only mentioned in Bk. 4 (and therein seven times, cc. 8, 43, 152, 181, 185, 196), a striking illustration of the 'Western' interest in that Book. The form of the designation in Hdt. is always adjectival (never Ἡρακλέος στῆλαι, as in Strabo 169), and the passages cited leave no room for doubt as to its geographical significance (= straits of Gibraltar), but Hdt. nowhere indicates exactly what he understands by the phrase. His contemporary Euktemon, of Athens, apparently understood the expression to apply to two Islands, 30 stades distant from each other, covered with wood, and inaccessible for large vessels, and each provided with a temple and an altar of Herakles: Euktemon *ap.* Avienum, *Or. maritim.* ed. A. Holder (cp. Berger, *Gesch. d. Wissensch. Erdkunde*, ii. 67). Pomponius Mela (temp. Claudii), a native of the region, considered the Pillars, or Columns, to be the two mountains, Calpe (*Gibraltar*) and Abyla (Ἀβίλυκα, Strabo 170: *Ceuta*), rising on the European and African side of the straits respectively (2. 6. 96; cp. Bunbury, *Anc. Geogr.* ii. 358). Poseidonios, however, his predecessor, who spent a considerable time at Gades (Strabo 174), believed that the Pillars were literally Pillars, to wit, the bronze Pillars 8 cubits (12 feet) high in the Herakleion at Gades; cp. Strabo 170, where the various alternatives (including that afterwards favoured by Mela) are set out and discussed, Strabo himself finally inclining to the metaphorical meaning (but not deciding between 'islands' and 'mountains'). Our clearer knowledge of the early import-

δὲ Σάμον ἐπιστέατο δόξῃ καὶ Ἡρακλέας στήλας ἴσον ἀπέχειν. συνέπιπτε δὲ τοιοῦτο ὥστε τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης ἀνωτέρω Σάμου μὴ τολμᾶν καταπλῶσαι καταρρωδηκότας, τοὺς δὲ Ἕλληνας, χρηιζόντων Χίων, τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ κατωτέρω Δήλου. οὕτω δέος τὸ μέσον ἐφύλασσε σφέων.

133 *Οἱ μὲν δὴ Ἕλληνες ἔπλεον ἐς τὴν Δῆλον, Μαρδόνιος δὲ*

---

15 *ἠπιστέατο* Pz || *δόξῃ* secl. van H. 16 *τοιοῦτον* **B**: *τοιούτῳ* z 17 *ἀνωτέρωι* **a** || *καταπλῶσαι*: *ἀναπλῶσαι*? Stein: *πλῶσαι* van H. || *καταρρωιδηκότες* P 18 verba *χρηιζόντων τῶν Χίων* suspecta habet van H.: *χρηζόντων* Apr.: *τῶν χίων* B 19 *κατωτέρωι* **a**P: *κατώτερον* Marc. || *δέος* **B**Pz: *δὲ ἐς* || *ἐφύλασσέ σφεων* Stein[1], Holder, van H.: (*ἐφύλασσόν* z) **133.** 1 *ἔπλωον* **B**z, van H.

---

ance of Pillar-worship (cp. A. J. Evans, *Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult*, 1901), and its undoubted association with the Tyrian Herakles (cp. Hdt. 2. 44) might incline us to take the western 'Pillars of Herakles' as really marking the limits of Phoenician navigation, and the metaphorical application as an afterthought; but such phrases as *δι' Ἡρακλέων στηλέων ἐκπλέειν, διεκπερᾶν* (4. 42, 43, 152) suggest that Hdt. uses the phrase with the metaphorical reference, and would have set the pillars either side the strait. The statement that "the Greeks at Delos (in 479 B.C.) believed (**ἐπιστέατο δόξῃ**, an interesting collocation) Samos as far off (**ἀπέχειν**, cp. 9. 52 *infra*) as Gades" is characterized by Rawlinson as "perhaps the grossest instance in Hdt. of rhetorical exaggeration" (5. 97 runs it close). But it should not be put down primarily to Hdt., least of all with the object, "by an imaginary effect of contrast, to place in a more striking light the rapid increase during his own time of nautical power and enterprise among his European fellow-countrymen" (Mure, quoted by Blakesley *ad l.*). Nor is it to be treated (so by Blakesley himself) as a serious record of real matter of fact, or feeling, explicable by the evil associations which had gathered at Sparta round "the voyage to Samos" (cp. 3. 56). The case is really much simpler. The phrase reproduces the impatience of Hdt.'s Ionian source with the cautious policy of the Spartan navarch (for which there were good grounds enough); or perhaps it even reflects the scornful witticisms of a period, the *Pentekontaëteris*, when Athenian policy had practically made the Aegean a *mare clausum* to Peloponnesian long-ships. At Delos the Hellenic fleet was in sight of Samos on a clear day, and before very long, in this very same year, crossed boldly to that bourne (9. 90 ff.). Hdt.'s device of projecting this account of the naval movement into the record of the previous winter and early spring has softened the inconsequence. What kept the Greek fleet at Delos was, first, that they demanded further assurances from the Ionians, and secondly, that they had to consider the situation behind them in Greece. Cp. Appendix IV. § 9, VII. § 7.

16. **συνέπιπτε . . ὥστε**: cp. c. 15 *supra*; there of a strictly formal coincidence, here of a rather more material one.

17. **καταπλῶσαι** Stein regards as a slip on a copyist's part for *ἀναπλῶσαι*, cp. *καταπλῶσαι ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην* just above, but *καταπλῶσαι* would then need to be supplied with **κατωτέρω Δήλου**, so the passage is not quite precisely composed; hence van Herwerden's suggestion is preferable; cp. App. Crit.

18. **χρηιζόντων Χίων**: the six Chians had presented themselves at Sparta, at Aigina, as *Ἰώνων ἄγγελοι*, but they were really or primarily mere *στασιῶται*, and their credentials may have been incomplete: the fleet advances on the advent of a Samian embassy, 9. 90 *infra*.

19. **τὸ μέσον**, 'the intervening space,' i.e. mutual fear kept them apart. Cp. 7. 11 *supra*.

133. 1. **ἔπλεον**: on this imperfect cp. c. 132 *supra*. Here it seems to be calculated rather with regard to what follows—the account of Mardonios, whose actions preceded in temporal order the move to Delos, or even the move to Aigina.

περὶ τὴν Θεσσαλίην ἐχείμαζε. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁρμώμενος ἔπεμπε κατὰ τὰ χρηστήρια ἄνδρα Εὐρωπέα γένος, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Μῦς, ἐντειλάμενος πανταχῇ μιν χρησόμενον ἐλθεῖν, τῶν οἷά τε ἦν σφι ἀποπειρήσασθαι. ὅ τι μὲν βουλόμενος ἐκμαθεῖν πρὸς τῶν χρηστηρίων ταῦτα ἐνετέλλετο, οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι· οὐ γὰρ ὦν λέγεται· δοκέω δ' ἔγωγε περὶ τῶν παρεόντων πρηγμάτων καὶ οὐκ ἄλλων πέρι πέμψαι. οὗτος ὁ Μῦς ἐς 134

2 ἐχειμέριζε? Krueger, van H. || ὁρμεόμενος **β**P, Stein[1], van H.: ὁρμεώμενος Cz 3 τὰ om. **β** || Εὐρωμέα emend. Stein, recep. Holder, van H. 4 χρησάμενον **α**CP, Stein[1] 5 ἐκμαθέειν *z* 7 δὲ **β** 8 περιπέμψαι B

2. **περὶ τὴν Θεσσαλίην ἐχείμαζε**: cp. c. 113 *supra*. The word χειμάζειν here (=Hdtn. χειμερίζειν) is observable; cp. 7. 191.

ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁρμώμενος: has the participle any real force? Does it mean 'as he was starting,' i.e. before leaving; or simply 'from headquarters there' (cp. c. 112 ἐξ Ἄνδρου ὁρμώμενος, where the phrase is not quite so much atrophied)?

3. **κατὰ τὰ χρηστήρια**: the preposition is observable, and appears to be used locally and distributively rather than of the object or purpose of the mission (i.e. not *ad consulenda oracula*); Stein cps. 1. 30 τὸν Σόλωνα θεράποντες περιῆγον κατὰ τοὺς θησαυρούς.

Εὐρωπέα γένος, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Μῦς, 'a man of Europos by name Mys.' Europos as a place-name or town (fem.) is found in several quarters, notably in Makedonia, Thuc. 2. 100. 3. (The towns of this name in further Asia were probably Makedonian foundations?) The man here named was evidently a Karian, cp. c. 135 *infra*: Steph. B. *sub v.* ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη Καρίας, τὴν Ἰδριάδα, ἀπὸ Ἰδρίος τοῦ Χρυσάορος (sc. ὀνομάζουσι). On Ἰδριάς cp. 5. 118. Oddly enough Steph. B. also has *sub v.* Εὔρωμος· πόλις Καρίας, ἀπὸ Εὐρώμου τοῦ Ἰδριέως Καρός. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Εὐρωμεύς. Of Europos he gives the *ethnikon* as Εὐρώπιος. Stein[2] suggested Εὐρωμέα as the true reading here, and Stein[5] suggests that Εὐρωπέα is an ancient error for Εὐρωμία (*sic*), i.e. from the small Karian town of Εὔρωμος (also Ὕρωμος). Blakesley (overlooking the Karian utterance of the Pythia below) makes Mys a Makedonian, and (observing that Europe was a surname of Demeter in the cult of Trophonios, Pausan. 9. 39. 5), an 'Achaian' to boot. Mys (mouse, 2. 141) as a proper name is curious, but genuine; there are several later instances, e.g. Pausan. 1. 28. 2 (a celebrated artist, possibly contemporary with Pheidias, as he is said to have executed the reliefs on the shield of the Promachos): a boxer, of Tarentum, Suidas *sub v.* etc.

4. **τῶν οἷά τε ἦν σφι ἀποπειρήσασθαι**: notwithstanding its plural form, οἷα does not refer to χρηστήρια, but=*pote* or *fas esset*: one relative is enough! The ἀπόπειρα of the Oracles by Mardonios, or Mys, is a genuine consultation, not a trial (διάπειρα 1. 47) or testing, like that of Kroisos 1. 46. On the contrary, it is a remarkable homage on the part of the Persian to the Greek religion. Delphi is apparently not one of the centres it is possible for him to consult!

6. **οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι· οὐ γὰρ ὦν λέγεται· δοκέω δ' ἔγωγε . .** Hdt.'s conjecture appears eminently reasonable, and is confirmed *pro tanto* by the anecdote in 9. 42 *infra*: it is, however, remarkable that Hdt. had not been able to discover the purport of Mardonios' inquiries—in other words, he had not been able to obtain any of the answers given to Mys. This circumstance certainly does not enhance the credit of the story, and taken in conjunction with the conspicuous absence of the Pythia, suggests the suspicion that the whole story may be a part of the *Rettung* of Delphi. But it has a *bona fide* air withal, and reads like a Boiotian memory. Was it, perhaps, one of the tales told Hdt. by his Boiotian friend Thersander of Orchomenos? Cp. 9. 16, and Introduction, § 10.

τε Λεβάδειαν φαίνεται ἀπικόμενος καὶ μισθῷ πείσας τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἄνδρα καταβῆναι παρὰ Τροφώνιον, καὶ ἐς Ἄβας τὰς Φωκέων ἀπικόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ χρηστήριον· καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς

---

134. 2 *λαβάδειαν* C || *ἀπικόμενος φαίνεται* z 3 *ἀνδρῶν ἄνδρα* Marc. 4 *δὴ καὶ* : *δὴ* **B**

---

134. 2. **Λεβάδειαν** : though the oracle is mentioned 1. 46, this is the only passage in Hdt. where the name of the city occurs, the modern *Livadia*, a place of more importance in Roman and Turkish than in ancient times. Plutarch *Lys.* 52 mentions its capture and sack by Lysander ; Strabo 414 marks its position : *Λεβάδεια δ' ἐστίν, ὅπου Διὸς Τροφωνίου μαντεῖον ἵδρυται, χάσματος ὑπονόμου κατάβασιν ἔχον, καταβαίνει δ' αὐτὸς ὁ χρηστηριαζόμενος· κεῖται δὲ μεταξὺ τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος καὶ τῆς Χαιρωνείας, Κορωνείας πλησίον.* Pausanias 9. 39, 40 describes the ritual from his own experience, and gives the story of the origin of the oracle. The process of consultation was extremely awful, and expensive, and apparently could not be carried on properly by a deputy, or deputy's deputy (as contemplated in this case). The oracle was, of course, chthonian, and *τροφώνιος* perhaps originally an epithet of Zeus.

3. **καταβῆναι παρὰ Τροφώνιον** : the grove (*ἄλσος*) of Trophonios was situate beyond the river Herkyna, which rose out of a cave in a gorge on Helikon. The worshipper crossed the stream and ascended through the grove (*ἀναβᾶσι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ μαντεῖον* Pausan. *l.c.*) to the cave in which the actual rite took place. Several days' preparation and initiation were necessary before the votary was permitted 'to descend' (*ἐς τοῦ Τροφωνίου κατιέναι*), and the privilege was reserved for the male sex (cp. *ἄνδρα* here, and *ἀνδρί* Pausanias *l.c.*). Purifications, divinations, sacrifices, are the order of the day, culminating in the offering of a ram on the night of the actual descent. You are first washed in the Herkyna, and anointed, by two acolytes, or 'Hermai' ; the priests then take you in hand, give you to drink of the waters of Oblivion and of Remembrance, display to your adoring gaze the ancient image, and invest you with proper garb, for the dire ordeal. You then essay 'the descent' into the house of Trophonios. In the oracular chamber is a mysterious opening, or well, carefully built round and over, about six feet in diameter, and some twelve feet in depth, looking like an oven. Into this pit you descend by a light ladder, introduced for the purpose, taking some honey-buns with you (cp. Aristoph. *Clouds* 507 f.). Arrived at the bottom, you find a small opening at one side, just large enough to admit you feet foremost : you lie down on your back and work through it ; and no sooner have your knees passed the aperture than you find yourself suddenly and irresistibly drawn or sucked down into the Holy of holies. There the secrets of the future are revealed to you in a way over which Pausanias somewhat abruptly drops the curtain. The exit has to be effected by the same entrance (*στόμα τὸ ἱερόν*), and again feet foremost. By this time you are more dead than alive, but the ordeal is not over. The priests set you on the seat of Remembrance, and question you on what you have seen and heard below : after they have obtained the requisite information, they return you to your anxious relatives or attendants, who convey you, in a state of trance or unconsciousness, back to your apartment at the sign of 'Good Luck and the Daimon.' But do not despair : no proper consultant has ever been known to expire under the ordeal, and some have lived to smile again after it.

ἐς Ἄβας : it required some effrontery on the part of the Persian to consult this oracle of Apollon ; cp. c. 33 *supra* ! Blakesley tries to get over the difficulty by supposing that the sack of the shrine was not the work of the division of the army commanded by Mardonios—but according to Blakesley himself Mardonios was commander-in-chief all along ; and again, that compensation was now made —of which Hdt. says nothing. The important point is that Hdt. is unconscious of the difficulty, so completely independent are his various stories one of another.

4. **καὶ δὴ καί** : c. 132 *supra*.

ἐς Θήβας may be taken in a wide sense to cover all the territory subject

Θήβας πρῶτα ὡς ἀπίκετο, τοῦτο μὲν τῷ Ἰσμηνίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐχρήσατο· ἔστι δὲ κατά περ ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἱροῖσι αὐτόθι χρηστηριάζεσθαι· τοῦτο δὲ ξεῖνόν τινα καὶ οὐ Θηβαῖον χρήμασι πείσας κατεκοίμησε ἐς Ἀμφιάρεω. Θηβαίων δὲ οὐδενὶ ἔξεστι μαντεύεσθαι αὐτόθι διὰ τόδε· ἐκέλευσε σφέας ὁ Ἀμφιά-

---

5 *ἰσμινίῳ* **B** 6 *κατά*: *καὶ τὰ* B 8 *κατεκοίμισε* **a**Pz || *ἀμφιάρεωι* B: *ἀμφιάραον* Paris. 1635, *z* 9 *ἐκέλευσέ σφεας* Stein[1], van H.: *ἐκέλευέ σφεας* CPz, Holder || *ἀμφιάρεος* **B**: *Αμφιάραος* *z*

---

to Thebes (so Baehr): the temple of Amphiaraos was not in Thebes proper. **πρῶτα** is rather puzzling; nothing is said of a second visit, though doubtless he had been to Thebes in passing through with the army to and from Athens, and doubtless visited it again in company with Mardonios (cc. 34, 50, 113 *supra*, 9. 2, 15 etc. *infra*). The meaning is complicated by **τοῦτο μέν · τοῦτο δέ** (in the first place, in the second place) immediately following. Stein suggests that *πρῶτα ὡς ἀπίκετο* equals *πρῶτα ἀπίκετο, ἀπικόμενος δέ*, but adds that Thebes was the first place he visited (coming from Mardonios in Thessaly?). Could Hdt. have meant *ὡς πρῶτα* ('as soon as he reached Thebes')? Cp. *ὡς τάχιστα* 1. 65.

5. **τῷ Ἰσμηνίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι**: cp. 5. 59, a passage which proves that Hdt. himself had at some time visited this shrine. It was perhaps subsequently, and after his visit, that he added the gloss-like note immediately succeeding **ἔστι δὲ . . χρηστηριάζεσθαι.** The procuration of a *χρηστήριον* by 'pyromancy' appears to be a special form of Divination developed by the Iamidai (cp. 9. 33 *infra*) of Elis; Pindar *Ol*. 8. 2 *μάντιες ἄνδρες ἐμπύροις τεκμαιρόμενοι παραπειρῶνται Διὸς ἀργικεραύνου.* Cp. Bouchè-Leclerq *ap.* Darenberg et Saglio, *Dict.* ii. 298, 299. It was practised also in Thebes; cp. Sophok. *O.T.* 21 *ἐπ' Ἰσμήνου τε μαντείᾳ σποδῷ.*

7. **ξεῖνον τινὰ . . κατεκοίμησε**: Plutarch *Aristeid.* 19 reports the actual dream which visited the 'Lydian,' and which exactly prefigured the death of Mardonios.

8. **ἐς Ἀμφιάρεω**: this oracle too figures in the list of Kroisos (cp. 1. 46, 49, 52), who, *πυθόμενος αὐτοῦ τήν τε ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν πάθην*, made presents to him, which in Hdt.'s time had been transferred to the temple of Ismenian Apollo (1. 52), perhaps to prevent their passing under Athenian dominion. The actual shrine of Amphiaraos himself was at Oropos, Pausan. 1. 34. His valour had been shown in his slaughter of Melanippos (in return for the deaths of Mekisteus and Tydeus; cp. 5. 67); his 'passion' in his terrible fate, the earth opening and swallowing him up, chariot and all, Pindar *Nem.* 9. 24, Aischyl. *Septem* 568 ff. The cult was confined practically to Peloponnesos and Central Greece, especially Boiotia (Bethe *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa, i. 1887), and the departed seer is really 'a chthonian deity of praehistoric Greece,' who, in the person of his son Amphilochos (cp. Thuc. 2. 68. 3), draws one step nearer to historic verisimilitude. The oracle was a dream-divination (Pausanias 1. 34. 5): the consultant, after due purification and sacrifice, sacrifices also a ram, goes to sleep upon its fell, and awaits a dream-revelation (*ἀναμένοντες δήλωσιν ὀνείρατος*). Amphiaraos is in some respects a replica of Trophonios (both being also distinctly of the Asklepios-type), perhaps because both are forms of chthonian Zeus.

Θηβαίων δὲ οὐδενὶ ἔξεστι: this taboo, or excommunication, is interesting. Was it restricted to Oropos (**αὐτόθι** *bis*), or were Thebans universally excluded from the cult of Amphiaraos? There was another Boiotian shrine of Amphiaraos near Potniai (Pausan. 9. 8. 3), but Pausanias does not record any divination there; at Harma, however, near Mykalessos, there was a temple (Strabo 404) in which, at least in later times, oracles were to be had (Bethe, *l.c. supra*). The context here might seem to imply that Thebans had once had oracles, or at least one response, of their ally.

9. **διὰ τόδε**: the taboo is obviously a much more certain fact than the reason given for it. The true reason might perhaps be sought in the difference of race between the Boiotians of Thebes

ρεως διὰ χρηστηρίων ποιεύμενος ὁκότερα βούλονται ἑλέσθαι τούτων, ἑωυτῷ ἢ ἅτε μάντι χρᾶσθαι ἢ ἅτε συμμάχῳ, τοῦ ἑτέρου ἀπεχομένους· οἳ δὲ σύμμαχόν μιν εἵλοντο εἶναι. διὰ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ ἔξεστι Θηβαίων οὐδενὶ αὐτόθι ἐγκατακοιμηθῆναι.

135 τόδε δὲ θῶμά μοι μέγιστον γενέσθαι λέγεται ὑπὸ Θηβαίων· ἐλθεῖν ἄρα τὸν Εὐρωπέα Μῦν, περιστρωφώμενον πάντα τὰ χρηστήρια, καὶ ἐς τοῦ Πτῴου Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ τέμενος. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ἱρὸν καλέεται μὲν Πτῷον, ἔστι δὲ Θηβαίων, κεῖται δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς Κωπαΐδος λίμνης πρὸς ὄρεϊ ἀγχοτάτω Ἀκραιφίης

11 τουτέων z || μάντει **a** || χρῆσθαι **a**d: χρέεσθαι reliqui 13 κατακοιμηθῆναι **β**Pz **135.** 1 τόδε Wesseling, van H., Stein[3]: τότε || θῶυμά CPz, Stein[1] 2 ἄρα: γὰρ? van H. || Εὐρωμέα Holder, van H., cf. c. 133 supra || Μῦν del. van H. || τὰ om. **β** 3 πτώιου A: πτώου 4 καλέεται . . ἱρὸν om. R || πτῶιον **a**: πτῶον || κέεται PSV, Stein[1] 5 κοπαΐδος A || ὄρει A[1]BS: οὔρεϊ || ἀγχοτάτωι **a**P: ἀγχοτάτῳ z || ἀκραιφνίης C

and the pre-Boiotian population to the south, and on the Attic border. Cult is stiffer than myth: the Boiotians of Thebes might appropriate the story of Amphiaraos and make him their friend and ally, but they could not get rid of the religious interdict. They then invented this reason to account for the fact.

10. **διὰ χρηστηρίων ποιεύμενος**: *per oraculum cum iis agens,* Baehr: apparently a spontaneous act. **τούτων** refers irregularly to the following alternatives.

12. **ἀπεχομένους** is strong middle. **ἐγκατακοιμηθῆναι** = *μαντεύεσθαι supra.*

135. 1. **τόδε**: cp. App. Crit. *τότε* would mean in 479 B.C.

θῶμά μοι μέγιστον: *μοι, à mon avis* (Larcher); but not exactly *maxime mirum* (Baehr), rather *miraculum, me judice, maximum.*

γενέσθαι, 'to have taken place.'

λέγεται ὑπὸ Θηβαίων: the citation of the source seems to suggest a doubt, or at least to decline a responsibility. **ἄρα** continues the note of admiration, or marks an advance, a heightening, of the action. (Cp. Index *sub v.*)

2. **περιστρωφώμενον πάντα τὰ χρ.**: *περιστρωφάομαι,* a frequentative of *περιστρέφομαι,* itself a word suggesting a rather hurried procedure, is perhaps hardly complimentary to Mys, whose methods all through are somewhat summary: is the word supplied by the 'Theban' source? The construction resembles *περιπλέοντες τὰς νήσους* 6. 99. Should not *πάντα* include Delphi?

3. **τοῦ Πτῴου Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ τέμενος,** 'the close of Ptoian Apollon,' i.e. the Apollo of Mount Ptous, the god being apparently named from the mount, not the mountain from the god. Mythologically Ptoos was a son of Athamas and Themisto (Asios *ap.* Pausan. 9. 23. 6), perhaps an afterthought. On the connexion of Athamas with this district cp. 7. 197 *supra.* The meaning of the word is obscure: Grasberger (*Gr. Ortsnamen,* p. 279) suggests 'Schreckenberg' (cp. Schreckhorn in Bernese Oberland); cp. *Φρίκιον* <*Φρίκωνις*?>, etc. Hdt.'s precise description of the site in the quasi-note **τοῦτο δὲ . . πόλιος** suggests autopsy; the note may be an addition. The force of the antithesis **καλέεται μὲν . . ἔστι δέ** is not obvious, but perhaps the sense that the name was older than the Theban (Boiotian) invasion and conquest underlies it.

5. **τῆς Κωπαΐδος λίμνης**: this is the only express mention in Hdt. of the Kopaic lake which occupied so large a space in W. Boiotia, at least in the winter months. The *Κωπαιῆς* or men of *Κῶπαι,* the township which gave its name to the lake, are mentioned by Thucyd. 4. 93. 4. Strabo 410–11 says that the lake had been called partially after the various cities on its edge until the name of (the insignificant) Kopai

πόλιος. ἐς τοῦτο τὸ ἱρὸν ἐπείτε παρελθεῖν τὸν καλεόμενον τοῦτον Μῦν (ἕπεσθαι δέ οἱ τῶν ἀστῶν αἱρετοὺς ἄνδρας τρεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ὡς ἀπογραψομένους τὰ θεσπιεῖν ἔμελλε), ... καὶ πρόκατε τὸν πρόμαντιν βαρβάρῳ γλώσσῃ χρᾶν. καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἑπομένους τῶν Θηβαίων ἐν θώματι ἔχεσθαι ἀκούοντας βαρβάρου γλώσσης ἀντὶ Ἑλλάδος, οὐδὲ ἔχειν ὅ τι χρήσωνται τῷ παρεόντι πρήγματι· τὸν δὲ Εὐρωπέα Μῦν ἐξαρπάσαντα παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἐφέροντο δέλτον, τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτεω γράφειν ἐς αὐτήν, φάναι δὲ Καρίῃ μιν γλώσσῃ χρᾶν, συγγραψάμενον δὲ οἴχεσθαι ἀπιόντα ἐς Θεσσαλίην.

7, 8 (*ἕπεσθαι . . ἔμελλε*) cancellos pos. Stein[3] || *δέ* om. **β***z*, Holder, van H. || *θεσπιέειν* **β**, Stein[1 2] || lacunam indic. Stein[3]   9 *τὴν* *z* || *μάντιν* Ppr.S   10 *θωΰματι* **β**, Stein[1], Holder || *ἐνέχεσθαι* Krueger   11 *οὐδ'* **β** || *χρήσωνται* **α**Pcorr.: *χρήσονται*   12 *χρήματι* C || *Εὐρωμέα*? vide 2 supra || *Μῦν* del. van H.   13 *αὐτέων* *z*   14 *γράφην* B || *γλώσσῃ* : *φωνῇ* **β**

---

prevailed: *κοιλότατον γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον*, that place being deepest in the vale (and so never dry).

Ἀκραιφίης: Akraiphia (*Ἀκραίφνιον* Pausan. 9. 23. 5) was apparently an unimportant township belonging to Thebes (though to judge by the coinage "it must have enjoyed intervals of autonomy," Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 292), and is described by Pausanias (*l.c.*) as standing some fifteen stades to the left of the temple. Dr. Frazer's note (*Pausanias* v. 97 ff.) deals with the whole situation fully from personal observation. The precise site of the temple (which has been archaeologically explored) is described (*ib.* p. 100) as a steep slope, elaborately terraced, high up on the chief mountain in the Ptoan range. On the highest or sixth terrace there is a spring; the temple actually stood on the fifth; lower down the hill is an artificial cavern, connected with the spring above by an earthenware conduit; the oracles were perhaps delivered in this cavern by the prophet, who had previously drunk of the water of the spring (an act paralleled by the procedure of the prophet of the Clarian Apollo, Frazer *l.c.*).

6. **ἐπείτε παρελθεῖν**: the *oratio obliqua* is resumed for the Theban narrative, after the interposed note in Hdt.'s own person. One must understand that the Theban government had appointed three commissioners to wait upon Mys. The subject of **ἔμελλε** must be *ὁ θεός*.

9. **καὶ πρόκατε**: there is an apparent parataxis, but if the text is correct, Hdt. must have forgotten the **ἐπείτε** above, and the result is an anakoluthon. Stein[5] supposes some words to have fallen out, e.g. *ἵζεσθαί τε ἐς τὸ μέγαρον*. The seer is here a man (*τὸν πρόμαντιν*), not a woman as at Delphi.

χρᾶν: as in 1. 55, 4. 155.

10. **ἐν θώματι ἔχεσθαι**, 'were spell-bound'; cp. below.

11. **Ἑλλάδος**: (as always) an adjective.

οὐδὲ ἔχειν, 'were at a complete loss'; cp. 5. 12.

13. **τὴν ἐφέροντο δέλτον**: on the imperf. cp. note c. 132 *supra*.

τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτεω γράφειν: it is tantalizing to think that this precious tablet was carried off by Mys to Thessaly, without even a copy being left behind! Nor does it appear that Hdt. had seen the original. There is no hope of recovering it now.

14. **Καρίῃ μιν γλώσσῃ χρᾶν**: sc. *τὸν προφήτην = τὸν πρόμαντιν*. Unless Mys was a Karian the selection of the Karian language would have been rather pointless. The story may be substantially true; it would not have been difficult to arrange that the prophet should babble a few words of Karian to the man of Euromos, or Europos. One need not

136 Μαρδόνιος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος ὅ τι δὴ λέγοντα ἦν τὰ χρηστήρια, μετὰ ταῦτα ἔπεμψε ἄγγελον ἐς Ἀθήνας Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Ἀμύντεω ἄνδρα Μακεδόνα, ἅμα μὲν ὅτι οἱ προσκηδέες οἱ Πέρσαι ἦσαν· Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ ἀδελφεὴν Γυγαίην, Ἀμύντεω δὲ θυγατέρα, Βουβάρης ἀνὴρ Πέρσης ἔσχε, ἐκ τῆς οἱ ἐγεγόνεε Ἀμύντης ὁ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ, ἔχων τὸ οὔνομα τοῦ μητροπάτορος, τῷ δὴ ἐκ βασιλέος τῆς Φρυγίης ἐδόθη Ἀλάβανδα πόλις

136. 1 ἦν λέγοντα Pz 3 οἳ R 4 ἔσαν z 6 τὸ om. C || ὄνομα van H. || τοῦ: τὸ **B**P: 'fortasse ἔχων ὄνομα τὸ τοῦ' van H. 7 τῷ: τὸ **B** || Ἀλάβαστρα Steph. Byz. quod verum opin. Stein, in text. rec. Holder: cf. comment. infra

summon up the 'subliminal consciousness' to explain this miracle.

136. 1. **ἐπιλεξάμενος ὅ τι δὴ λέγοντα ἦν τὰ χρηστήρια**, 'after reading what the oracles were saying, whatever it was,' a good illustration of the deceptive character of the *formulae* of the *vox viva* when used to establish the nature of Hdt.'s sources; cp. Introduction, § 10.

2. **μετὰ ταῦτα**: i.e. 'after doing so.'

ἄγγελον = *πρεσβέα* (cp. 7. 1), and is predicative.

Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Ἀμύντεω ἄνδρα Μακεδόνα: the mere occurrence of the patronymic would not surprise, even though Alexander has been introduced at great length in Bk. 5, and mentioned before in these Books; but the precise repetition of the formula of 7. 173 *supra* is a little perplexing, and that formula is in itself remarkable. The repetition is, perhaps, to be explained by the hypothesis that the present passage is of earlier composition, and the passage in Bk. 7 a later insertion. The peculiar formula itself, which ignores the fact that Alexander was at this time king in Makedonia, is more difficult to away with. Blakesley suggests that "out of delicacy to democratic feelings" Hdt. omits reference to Alexander's true position—an explanation which sounds a little thin: more probably Hdt. takes over the phrase from his source, whatever it was; an explanation which, it must be admitted, only puts the difficulty one step backwards: perhaps the recognition of this passage as relatively early in Hdt.'s composition may ease his apparent oversight. The complete independence of the present passage is shown by a reference to c. 34 *supra*, where Alexander is acting as king or commander of *ἄνδρες Μακεδόνες*.

3. Hdt. gives two co-ordinate reasons (**ἅμα μὲν . . ἅμα δέ**) for the selection of Alexander as ambassador to Athens: (i.) his special relation to the Persians on the one side; (ii.) his special relation to the Athenians on the other.

προσκηδέες: *affinitate coniuncti*, cp. Pollux 3. 5 ff. (*ὅσοι τὴν οἰκειότητα τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐκ συνθήκης ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔχουσι ib.* 6; *προσκηδεῖς καθ' Ἡρόδοτον ib.* 30).

4. **Γυγαίην . . Βουβάρης . . ἔσχε**, 'had to wife' (cp. 7. 61. 13). The story of this marriage is told in Bk. 5. 21. This match was a precedent for the Great Alexander, had he needed one. The absence of any reference here to that passage is significant for the problem of composition, and points to the priority of the present passage. Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8. The name *Γυγαίη* in Makedonia (cp. 1. 93 for Lydia) is remarkable; cp. c. 138 *infra*. On Bubares cp. 7. 22 *supra*.

5. **ἐγεγόνεε Ἀμύντης**: this Amyntas, son of Bubares and Gygaia, had no doubt long been born (*ἐγεγόνεε*) in 480 B.C., the marriage of his parents having taken place at least a quarter of a century before; but the date of his establishment as a bey or grandee in Asia Minor is not so clear, nor whether it was due to Dareios or to Xerxes: probably the latter.

6. **μητροπάτορος**: 6. 131.

7. **τῆς Φρυγίης . . Ἀλάβανδα**: there is a double difficulty here: (i.) Alabanda was under a native tyranny apparently, cp. 7. 195. But as the tyrant was taken by the Greeks in 480 B.C. (*l.c.*) Amyntas might have been appointed to succeed him. (ii.) But Alabanda was, and is there correctly described as being, in Karia. Rawlinson observes that geographical

μεγάλη νέμεσθαι· ἅμα δὲ ὁ Μαρδόνιος πυθόμενος ὅτι πρόξεινός τε εἴη καὶ εὐεργέτης ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἔπεμπε. τοὺς γὰρ Ἀθηναίους οὕτω ἐδόκεε μάλιστα προσκτήσεσθαι, λεών τε πολλὸν ἄρα ἀκούων εἶναι καὶ ἄλκιμον, τά τε κατὰ τὴν θάλασσαν

---

8 δὲ Wesseling e cod. Ask.: τε || *πρόξενός* codd. *z* 9 *εὐεργέτης Ἀθηναίων* Reiske: 'an *σφι εἴη?*' Stein[2], van H. 10 *ἐδόκει* van H. || *προσκτήσασθαι* **β**Ppr. || *λῃόν* van H.

---

limits were not always strictly defined; still, it would be rather curious to find Hdt. putting a large city into Karia in one Book, and into Phrygia in the next, without a word of explanation; though the difference of sources, and the historian's indifference to their disharmony, will doubtless account for a good deal; cp. Introduction, § 11. Stein approves of Steph. B. *Ἀλάβαστρα, πόλις Φρυγίας. Ἡρόδοτος.* But unfortunately the other authorities, Ptolemy 4. 5. 59, Pliny 5. 9. 61, place Alabastra in Egypt (cp. 3. 20).

8. **νέμεσθαι**: epexegetical infinitive.

πρόξεινός τε . . καὶ εὐεργέτης: on the *προξενία* cp. 6. 57, 9. 85. What *beneficium* Alexander conferred, or can have conferred on the Athenian democracy before 480 B.C. (unless his action recorded 7. 173 *supra* were to be so accounted), is unknown: Blakesley suggested that the connexion was with the Peisistratids, not with the Athenian democracy; cp. 5. 94. But there may have been some approximation during the period of the Ionian Revolt. The story here is doubtless tinged with afterthought and anachronism; following the Persian war there must have been friendly relations between Athens and Makedon for a time, or off and on, during Alexander's reign. Athenian aggression in the north, culminating in the foundation of Amphipolis in 436 B.C. (Busolt III. i. 558), must have strained these relations; and it is quite clear from Thucydides that the hostility of Perdikkas, son of Alexander, precipitated the (so-called) 'Peloponnesian' war (Thuc. 1. 56. 2, 57. 2 etc.).

The structure of the passage **Μαρδόνιος δὲ . . ἔπεμπε** is not elegant or quite correct: *oratio turbata*, Baehr. It runs: *Μαρδόνιος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος . . ἔπεμπε . . ἅμα μὲν ὅτι . .* long parenthesis *. . ἅμα δὲ ὁ Μαρδόνιος πυθόμενος ὅτι εἴη . . ἔπεμπε.* Perhaps it marks Hdt.'s less accomplished and earlier style.

9. **τοὺς γὰρ Ἀθηναίους**: his object was to obtain the alliance, or the allegiance, of the Athenians, whereto his motive was simply the desire to win command of the sea.

Hdt. fully endorses this calculation (**τά περ ἂν καὶ ἦν**): alliance with Athens would have given Mardonios, and Persia, a vast superiority at sea.

Mardonios can hardly have failed to understand (what Hdt. appears in this place to miss) that the predominance at sea would *ipso facto* carry predominance by land too—not merely by withdrawing the Athenian land-force from the confederate army, and completely localizing resistance in the Peloponnese, but by opening wide the doors into the Peloponnese itself—as Hdt. elsewhere and afterwards implies (9. 9 *infra*, cp. 7. 139 *supra*). In this passage command of the sea is treated as a purely negative condition, however important, and Mardonios having obtained it, by alliance with Athens, is to finish the struggle on land simply with his own land-forces.

The passage also runs into a somewhat verbose testimonial to Athenian prowess, *ex hypothesi* apparently now conveyed to Mardonios by word of mouth (**ἀκούων**) for the first time. As a matter of fact Mardonios must long have known all this and much more about the Athenians, cp. 7. 6 *supra*. Hdt. is here perhaps the victim of his Attic sources.

11. **ἄρα**, 'to his surprise' (rather than 'of course'): perhaps there is a touch of irony in the word.

τά τε κατὰ θάλασσαν . . ἐπίσταντο. The verb is co-ordinate with *ἐδόκεε*, and in its Herodotean use not of much stronger import (cp. c. 132 *supra*): the co-ordinate sentence, however, extends from *τοὺς γάρ* to *καὶ ἄλκιμον*, and the material considerations in the mind of Mardonios are, *ex hypothesi*, (i.) the number and valour of the Athenians, (ii.) their recent achievements at sea.

συντυχόντα σφι παθήματα κατεργασαμένους μάλιστα Ἀθηναίους ἐπίστατο. τούτων δὲ προσγενομένων κατήλπιζε εὐπετέως τῆς θαλάσσης κρατήσειν, τά περ ἂν καὶ ἦν, πεζῇ τε ἐδόκεε πολλῷ εἶναι κρέσσων, οὕτω τε ἐλογίζετο κατύπερθέ οἱ τὰ πρήγματα ἔσεσθαι τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν. τάχα δ᾽ ἂν καὶ τὰ χρηστήρια ταῦτά οἱ προλέγοι, συμβουλεύοντα σύμμαχον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον ποιέεσθαι· τοῖσι δὴ πειθόμενος ἔπεμπε.

137 Τοῦ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τούτου ἕβδομος γενέτωρ Περδίκκης

---

12 *σφίσι?* van H. 13 *ἐπιστέατο* **B**: *ἠπίστατο* z ‖ *τουτέων* z 14 *ἂν* : *ἦν* z ‖ *ἐδόκει* van H. 15 *κρείσσων* **B** 16 *τῶν* om. C ‖ *ἑλλήνων. τάχα δὲ τὰ* **B** 17 *προλέγουσι* **B**: *προλέγει* z 18 *ποιεῖσθαι* van H.: *οἱ ποιήσασθαι* **B** **137.** 1 *περδίκης* BC**B**

---

12. The **παθήματα** may include Artemision as well as Salamis (but hardly the disasters due to the storm!): in any case the view ascribed to Mardonios differs from the official Greek view, c. 93 *supra*, though it represents exactly the Athenian view, cp. Thucyd. 1. 74.

15. **κατύπερθε . . ἔσεσθαι**: cp. c. 19 *supra*.

16. **τάχα δ᾽ ἂν καὶ τὰ χρηστήρια ταῦτά οἱ προλέγοι**: Hdt. opines that Mardonios may have been urged to the above course (*ταῦτα*) by the oracles (consulted by Mys). Rawlinson observes that the Theban "and Phokian" oracles may very well have done so (well, hardly Abai, cp. c. 134 *supra*—but perhaps Delphi?). The *ἀκούων* above suggests that Mardonios was being worked upon: his Theban advisers below (9. 2) have still a card in reserve. The construction with the opt. present (and a suppressed protasis) is observable: the explanation by the *res praeterita* which is *diuturnior vel saepius repetita* (Baehr) is hardly applicable: Stein calls it 'a potential present' and cps. 1. 70 *τάχα δὲ ἂν καὶ οἱ ἀποδόμενοι λέγοιεν κτλ.*, certainly a more difficult case, for here the opt. pres. might seem to accord with the phrase used above, *ἐπιλεξάμενος ὅ τι δὴ λέγοντα ἦν τὰ χρηστήρια.*

137. 1. **τοῦ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τούτου ἕβδομος γενέτωρ.** An excursus follows (cc. 137–139) *on the origin of the Makedonian monarchy.* That this story is given in these Books rather than in Bk. 5. 22, yea, actually there promised, is strong evidence in favour of the hypothesis that Bks. 7, 8, 9 are of earlier composition; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8: that it is given here rather than at 7. 173 is perhaps in favour of regarding that passage as of later insertion; cp. Introd. § 9.

The Makedonian pedigree could hold its own with the Achaimenid (7. 11 *supra*), to say nothing of its affiliation, through Temenos, with Herakles (cp. c. 139 *infra*). The 'seven' are reckoned inclusively, notwithstanding *γενέτωρ* (pro-genitor: an *hapaxlegomenon* in Hdt.).

Περδίκκης. Did Alexander himself emphasize the founder's name by giving it to his own son and successor (*c.* 454 B.C.)? Is the legend, in its Herodotean form, older than the accession of Perdikkas II. (*c.* 454 B.C.)? See below. In any case Hdt. was hardly the first author to reduce it to writing, or even to prose: that had surely been done already at the Makedonian Court. Thucydides in 2. 99. 3 asserts the Argive and Temenid descent, in 2. 100. 2 gives the same number of kings (without the names), adding Perdikkas and Archelaos his own contemporaries; and in 5. 80 supplies a practical illustration of the force of the Argive claim (alliance in 417 B.C.). Another and perhaps later saga made Karanos (*Κάρανος*), son or brother of Pheidon of Argos, found the dynasty, to be succeeded by *Κοῖνος, Τυρίμμας, Περδίκκας.* This version was first given vogue by Theopompos; cp. Vell. Pat. 1. 6. 5 *Circa quod tempus* (sc. Carthag. cond.) *Caranus, vir generis regii, sextus decimus ab Hercule* (?), *profectus Argis, regnum Macedoniae occupavit: a quo magnus Alexander quum fuerit septimus decimus, iure materni generis Achille auctore, paterni Hercule gloriatus est.* Cp.

ἐστὶ ὁ κτησάμενος τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν τυραννίδα τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. ἐξ Ἄργεος ἔφυγον ἐς Ἰλλυριοὺς τῶν Τημένου ἀπογόνων τρεῖς ἀδελφεοί, Γαυάνης τε καὶ Ἀέροπος καὶ Περδίκκης, ἐκ δὲ Ἰλλυριῶν ὑπερβαλόντες ἐς τὴν ἄνω Μακεδονίην ἀπίκοντο ἐς Λεβαίην πόλιν. ἐνθαῦτα δὲ ἐθήτευον ἐπὶ μισθῷ παρὰ τῷ βασιλέι, ὃ μὲν ἵππους νέμων, ὃ δὲ βοῦς,

---

3 *ἰλλυρικοὺς* **B** 5 *περδίκης* CS || *ἰλλύρων* R || *ὑπερβαλλόντες* BV 6 *δὲ*: *καὶ z* 7 *βασιλεῖ* AB

Pompeius Trogus 7. 1. 7 ff., Theopompus *Frag.* 29, 30 (Mueller i. 283). A third variant was supplied by Euripides' Ἀρχέλαος, cp. Nauck[1] p. 339, Hyginus *Fab.* 219 (quoted in full by Nauck and by Stein). This story was more romantic. Archelaos, a son of Temenos, exiled by his brethren, took refuge in Makedonia, and having won a victory for the king, demanded his promised reward (*regnum et filiam*): the king, however, sought his benefactor's life: the plot was betrayed: Archelaos took his would-be slayer in the pit prepared for him: *inde profugit ex responso Apollinis in Macedoniam capra duce oppidumque ex nomine caprae Aegas constituit.* As this story was obviously adopted by Euripides in compliment to the reigning Archelaos, so the version in Hdt. is probably a compliment to Perdikkas, devised on his accession (the precise circumstances of which are obscure; cp. Busolt, III. i. 558, ii. 792).

2. **τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν τυραννίδα**: the phrase is remarkable: had Hdt. not yet acquired his horror of the *τυραννίς*, or does he mean to condemn Perdikkas I. and his whole descent, or does he take the phrase over from his source, or does he design to prepare the way for the Spartan epigram (c. 142 *infra*), or does calling the Makedonian principality a tyranny assimilate it to Greek conditions, or is *τυραννίς* used here as it might be of the Lydian, or any foreign monarchy? Cp. 7. 52 *supra*.

3. **ἐξ Ἄργεος**. There existed an Ἄργος Ὀρεστικόν in the Orestis (cp. Thuc. 2. 80. 6), a district round the sources of the Haliakmon, in Upper Makedonia; Strabo 326 reckons the Orestis to Epeiros, and records the foundation of this Argos by Orestes: obviously an etymological fallacy. Probably the Makedonian royal house had as little real connexion with Peloponnesian Argos as had Orestes with the Orestis in Upper Makedonia. **ἐς Ἰλλυριούς** perhaps gives the real *ὅθεν ὁρμώμενοι*. Cp. l. 5 *infra*.

4. **Γαυάνης**: Stein takes the name as $=$ *βουκόλος*, cp. Sansk. *gô* $=$ *βοῦς, γῆ*. If so, Hdt. has got the translations or interpretations just below in reverse order.

Ἀέροπος: the name appears in its Ionic form 9. 26 *infra*; the preservation of the proper form here will be due to the source. The name might perhaps be applicable to the herder of horses, 'swift as air,' but there was a mountain bordering on the Aous of that name, Livy 32. 5. 11, and Hesychios has the gloss *Ἀέροπος, ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ γένος τι*, an indication of the real significance of the three names as divisions of the Makedonian folk, or perhaps of the *Ἀργεάδαι*, Strabo 329 (cp. the tripartition of the Skyths 4. 5 etc.) (Stein). The name Aeropos as a proper name recurs, however, in the list of Makedonian kings in the fourth century B.C. Cp. c. 139.

5. **Περδίκκης**: he looks after *τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν προβάτων*, a true shepherd, or goatherd. The expression suggests that Hdt. might use *πρόβατα* of larger animals; cp. 9. 93 *infra*.

ἐκ δὲ Ἰλλυριῶν ὑπερβαλόντες looks like a genuine reminiscence of the origin of the Makedonian *Ἀργεάδαι*. The route indicated would be over Mt. Skardos, presumably by the line of the later Egnatian Way. *ὑπερβ.* 7. 168 in a somewhat different sense.

ἐς τὴν ἄνω Μακεδονίην: cp. 7. 128. **Λεβαίη** is nowhere else mentioned, nor identifiable; a problem of the same order as Kritalla, 7. 26.

6. **ἐθήτευον ἐπὶ μισθῷ**: Homeric (not to say feudal); cp. *Od.* 4. 644. The *μισθός* included board and lodging.

7. **παρὰ τῷ βασιλέι**: Pausan. 9. 40. 8 gives his name as *Κισσεύς*. So too Hyginus (Euripides); cp. note, l. 1 *supra*.

ὁ δὲ νεώτατος αὐτῶν Περδίκκης τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν προβάτων. ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τοῦ βασιλέος αὐτὴ τὰ σιτία σφι ἔπεσσε· ἦσαν γὰρ τὸ πάλαι καὶ αἱ τυραννίδες τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθενέες χρήμασι [οὐ μοῦνον ὁ δῆμος]. ὅκως δὲ ὀπτῴη, ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ [θητὸς] Περδίκκεω διπλήσιος ἐγίνετο αὐτὸς ἑωυτοῦ. ἐπεὶ δὲ αἰεὶ τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ἐγίνετο, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἑωυτῆς· τὸν δὲ ἀκούσαντα ἐσῆλθε αὐτίκα ὡς εἴη τέρας καὶ φέροι μέγα τι. καλέσας δὲ τοὺς θῆτας προηγόρευέ σφι ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἐκ γῆς τῆς ἑωυτοῦ. οἱ δὲ τὸν μισθὸν ἔφασαν δίκαιοι εἶναι ἀπολαβόντες οὕτω ἐξιέναι. ἐνθαῦτα ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ μισθοῦ πέρι ἀκούσας, ἦν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν καπνοδόκην ἐς τὸν οἶκον ἐσέχων ὁ ἥλιος, εἶπε θεοβλαβὴς γενόμενος "μισθὸν δὲ ὑμῖν ἐγὼ ὑμέων ἄξιον τόνδε ἀποδίδωμι," δείξας τὸν ἥλιον.

---

8 *αὐτέων z* || *περδίκης* CS 9 *ἡ δὲ . . ἔπεσσε* sedem hab. infra post *δῆμος*, huc retrax. Stein || *βασιλέως* R : *βασιλῆος z* || *σφι τὰ σιτία* S || *ἔσαν z* 10 *γὰρ* : *δὲ* **β**, Holder, van H. : verba *ἦσαν . . δῆμος* ut emblema a sciolo quodam addito del. van H. : *οὐ μοῦνον ὁ δῆμος* damn. Stein[1 3], Holder. Nonne verba *ἦσαν γὰρ . . χρήμασι* inter *βασιλέος* et *αὐτὴ* potius inserenda ? 11 *μοῦνον* **a** : *μόνον* || *ὀπτώιη* AB : *ὀπτῷτο* (Holder, van H.) 12 *τοῦ θητὸς Περδίκκεω* damn. Stein[1], secl. van H. : *θητὸς* tantum Stein[3] : *τοῦ περδίκκεω* Pz, Holder, van H. : *τοῦ περδίκεω* **β** || *ἑωυτῷ z* 13 *ἐπείτε* ? van H. || *ἐγένετο* R || *τὸν* ante *ἑωυτῆς* om. *z* 14 *ὡς δὲ ἤκουσε* Paris. 1635 *z* || *ἐπῆλθέ οἱ z* 15 *φέροι ἐς* **β***z* 16 *γῆς* om. **β***d* || *ἔφασαν τὸν μισθὸν* **β** 17 *δίκαιοι* AC : *δίκαιον* || *εἶναι* post *μισθὸν* **β** || *ἀπολαβόντας* R*z* || *οὕτως* **β** 20 *τόδε* C || *δέξας* Holder, van H. || <*ἐς*> *τὸν* ? Stein[(2)], van H.

---

9. **ἡ δὲ γυνή**: was the *ἀρτοκόπος* of Kroisos a queen, 1. 51? Hardly; the circumstances here are more primitive. Cp. the story of the Molossian queen, Thuc. 1. 136.

ἦσαν γὰρ . . χρήμασι: a note worthy of Thucydides' *Archaiologia*! The use of *αἱ τυραννίδες* after *βασιλεύς* (*bis*) is significant; cp. 1. 2 *supra*. For textual critique cp. App. Crit. Does the note explain why the queen was cook, or why the herds were provided for in the house (or both)? The story is all in one genre, making it easier for the herd to turn king, that he has had a queen a-baking for him. Blakesley cites Nausikaa a-washing (*Od.* 6) and the brothers of Andromache tending herds, *Il.* 6. 422. Cp. *Psalm* 78, *elegit David servum suum et sustulit eum de gregibus ovium.*

11. **ὁ ἄρτος . . διπλήσιος . . αὐτὸς ἑωυτοῦ**, 'the loaf of the laddie became twice its own proper size.' The 'double portion' was a portent (**τέρας**) indicating kingship; cp. 6. 57, 7. 103. *διπλήσιος* is treated as a comparative; cp. also 2. 25.

15. **φέροι μέγα τι**: of great significance, portentous.

17. **οὕτω**: i.e. *ἀπολαβόντες*: they declined to depart until they had received their wages; the nominatives *δίκαιοι . . ἀπολαβόντες* are nicely idiomatic. **κατά**, 'down.'

18. **καπνοδόκη**: cp. 4. 103, probably a simple aperture in the roof, or dome. The construction of the Balkan house or palace is in question! It had only a clay floor. Was it more than a domed hut?

19. **ἐσέχων**, 'streaming in,' yet not quite like one river into another, as in 1. 193, nor as a canal into a sea, 2. 158, nor as a bay of the sea into the land, 2. 11. But cp. *ἀρυσάμενος infra.*

ὁ μὲν δὴ Γαυάνης τε καὶ ὁ Ἀέροπος οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἕστασαν ἐκπεπληγμένοι, ὡς ἤκουσαν ταῦτα· ὁ δὲ παῖς, ἐτύγχανε γὰρ ἔχων μάχαιραν, εἴπας τάδε "δεκόμεθα ὦ βασιλεῦ τὰ διδοῖς," περιγράφει τῇ μαχαίρῃ ἐς τὸ ἔδαφος τοῦ οἴκου τὸν ἥλιον, περιγράψας δέ, ἐς τὸν κόλπον τρὶς ἀρυσάμενος τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀπαλλάσσετο αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ μετ' ἐκείνου. οἳ μὲν δὴ 138 ἀπήισαν, τῷ δὲ βασιλέι σημαίνει τις τῶν παρέδρων οἷόν τι χρῆμα ποιήσειε [ὁ παῖς] καὶ ὡς σὺν νόῳ κείνων ὁ νεώτατος λάβοι τὰ διδόμενα. ὃ δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούσας καὶ ὀξυνθεὶς πέμπει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἱππέας ἀπολέοντας. ποταμὸς δὲ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ταύτῃ, τῷ θύουσι οἱ τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν <τῶν> ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἀπόγονοι σωτῆρι· οὗτος, ἐπείτε διέβησαν οἱ Τημενίδαι, μέγας οὕτω ἐρρύη ὥστε τοὺς ἱππέας μὴ οἵους τε γενέσθαι διαβῆναι. οἳ δὲ ἀπικόμενοι ἐς ἄλλην γῆν τῆς Μακεδονίης οἴκησαν πέλας τῶν κήπων τῶν λεγομένων εἶναι Μίδεω τοῦ Γορδίεω, ἐν τοῖσι

---

21 καὶ Ἀέροπος **B**, Holder || οἱ πρεσβύτεροι del. van H., Holder : οἱ πρεσβύτατοι **B** 23 ὧδε δεχόμεθα **a**C || βασιλεὺς C 24 τοὔδαφος z 25 ἀφυσάμενος van H. 26 ἐκείνῳ **B** : αὐτοῦ z **138.** 2 ἀπῇσαν C : ἀπήεσαν P : ἀπίεσαν **B**z || βασιλεῖ AB || σημαίναι S || τῶν τις Krueger, van H. 3 ὁ παῖς secl. Stein³ || συνόωι C : συνόω B || ἐκείνων **B**Pz : κακείνων C : ἐκείνων ὁ νεώτατος secl. van H. 4 δεδομένα Pz 5 <ὡς> ἀπολέοντας Naber 6 τουτέων z || <τῶν> ? van H., Stein³ || ἀπ' Ἄργεος : ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Krueger : nonne potius cum van H. deleveris ? 7 σωτήρια z 8 οὕτως **a** || τε om. **B** 10 τούτοισι **B**

---

22. **ἐτύγχανε . . ἔχων μάχαιραν**: how did he come by it? If the truth were told, probably this *μάχαιρα* had a good deal to say to the sequel! Was it of iron? Was it a claymore? Or merely a serving man's dirk?

23. **δεκόμεθα ὦ βασιλεῦ τὰ διδοῖς**: exactly the same *motif* appears in the anecdote, c. 114 *supra*; and with the corresponding *motifs* *οἵας ἐκείνοισι πρέπει, ὑμέων ἄξιον*.

25. **τρὶς ἀρυσάμενος**, 6. 119, as though it had been water, a symbolical action, repeated, symbolically, thrice: for 'three' and its multiples are significant numbers; cp. 1. 86, 5. 105, and countless illustrations in all literatures, rituals, games and formulae.

138. 2. **παρέδρων**: i.e. 'councillors,' as in 7. 147, rather than boon-companions, as in 5. 18. **ἱππέας**, 'horsemen.' The political and military institutions of this king seem more advanced than the domestic.

3. **σὺν νόῳ**, 8. 86. The Sun-rite appears to have more than a single purpose: Perdikkas symbolically takes possession of the Hearth and Home of the giver, and takes the Sun to witness his claim. Stein quotes Grimm, *Rechtsalt.* 278, on the Sun as the source of real property: the story of Dareios' accession is also to be cited, 3. 86. Cp. also 7. 8, ll. 37 ff. *supra*.

5. **ποταμὸς δὲ ἐστὶ . . σωτῆρι**: the name of the river is unfortunately not given; it could hardly have been missing if Hdt. had himself culled this story at the Makedonian court. It would probably be the Erigon or Haliakmon; Stein prefers the former, as Hdt. nowhere mentions it by name, though he has the Axios (of which it is a tributary) and the Haliakmon. *σωτήρια* would be very agreeable; cp. App. Crit. Stein thinks *ἔτι καὶ νῦν* has dropped out after *θύουσι*.

9. **ἐς ἄλλην γῆν τῆς Μακεδονίης**: no doubt *Μακεδονὶς* proper, cp. 7. 127.

10. **τῶν κήπων . . Μίδεω τοῦ Γορδίεω.** Midas, son of Gordias, is, of course, a

φύεται αὐτόματα ῥόδα, ἓν ἕκαστον ἔχον ἑξήκοντα φύλλα, ὀδμῇ τε ὑπερφέροντα τῶν ἄλλων. ἐν τούτοισι καὶ ὁ Σιληνὸς τοῖσι κήποισι ἥλω, ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν κήπων ὄρος κέεται Βέρμιον οὔνομα, ἄβατον ὑπὸ χειμῶνος.

---

12 *ἄλλων* <*καὶ χροιῇ*> ? Stein(2) || *σίληνος* R : *σηληνὸς* S : *σήληνὸς* V : *δηλινὸς* Paris. 1635 13 *τοῖσι κήποισι* del. Cobet 14 *οὖρος* CPz || *κεῖται* **a**, van H. || *βέρβιον* **B** || *ὄνομα* van H.

'Phrygian' (cp. 1. 14, 35), and 'Silenos' has already met us on the Marsyas, cp. 7. 26 *supra*, but it does not therefore follow that the Midas and Silenos myths have been transported from Asia, from Phrygia, into Europe, into Makedonia. Did not the Bryges, or Phryges, go from the Axios to the Marsyas? Do they not represent a folk perhaps pressed out by the advancing 'Makedonians' or even the antecessors of the Makedonians? Cp. 7. 73 *supra*.

11. **ἓν ἕκαστον**: in apposition to **ῥόδα**. Hdt. nowhere else mentions the rose.

φύλλα: apparently here 'petals'—the roses must have been 'double': do such grow wild (**αὐτόματα**)? And have any wild roses such a perfume? Did the Greeks greatly affect flower-gardens? Were their views on cultivation not rather utilitarian, apter *auctumno carpere poma*, than *vere rosam*? The garden of Alkinoos grew mainly fruit-trees; the rose is used by Homer but to paint the fingers of the Morn (*ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς*), or to preserve the corpse of Hektor withal (*Il.* 23. 186): a utility. The simple word first occurs in the *Hymn to Demeter*, 6.

12. **ὑπερφέροντα**: cp. c. 44 *supra*, 9. 96 *infra*.

ὁ Σιληνὸς . . ἥλω: cp. 7. 26 *supra*; the article here might possibly be in reference to the 'Silenos' of that passage, but is more probably used on more general grounds, 'the notorious.' The 'capture' this time is not made by Apollo, but by Midas, who caught Silenos and conversed with him (Plutarch *l.c.*). Theopompos *ap.* Aelian, *V.H.* 3. 18, puts a long fable on the Happy Land into the mouth of Silenos; Aristotle represented him as something of a pessimist (Plutarch *Mor.* 115) and very reluctant to answer the question of Midas, *τί ποτέ ἐστι τὸ βέλτιον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις;* Cp. Cicero, *Tusc. Dist.* 1. 48 *Affertur etiam de Sileno fabella quaedam: qui quum a Mida captus esset, hoc ei muneris pro sua missione dedisse scribitur; docuisse regem non nasci homini longe optimum esse; proximum autem quam primum mori.* That melancholy doctrine was 'Trausic' or 'Thracian' according to Hdt. 5. 4 (cp. my note *ad l.*).

13. **ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων.** The citation of the authority, or source, implies a misgiving, but does not prove that Hdt. had the story from headquarters, or was not drawing on literature. The version given was obviously 'Makedonian' in origin; cp. 7. 73.

ὑπέρ: higher up the country, further inland.

14. **ὄρος . . Βέρμιον**: cp. Strabo 330 (Z 25) *τὸ Βέρμιον ὄρος ὃ πρότερον κατεῖχον Βρίγες Θρᾳκῶν ἔθνος ὧν τινες διαβάντες εἰς τὴν Ἀσίην Φρύγες μετωνομάσθησαν. ib.* 26 *ἡ Βέροια πόλις ἐν ταῖς ὑπωρείαις κεῖται τοῦ Βερμίου ὄρους.* The wealth of Midas is traced (Strabo 680) to the mines *περὶ τὸ Β. ὄ.* The mountain is identified with the range between the Haliakmon and the Lydias, the highest point of which now bears the name of *Dhoxá*. The exact position of the Rose Garden is more in dispute. Hdt. here places it in the neighbourhood of the city of Beroia (without naming it); i.e. in Makedonia proper, 7. 127. Abel (*Makedonien*, pp. 110 ff.) would place it further north, in the neighbourhood of Edessa, or Aigai, the more ancient cradle of the Makedonian folk. Kortüm (*ap.* Baehr *ad l.*) very happily relegates the Rose Garden to the same mythical region as Kriemhilt's *Rosengarten zu Worms am Rhin* (Rîn), but instead of Kriemhilt and Brunhilt, Gunther and Siegfrid, we have here only Midas and Silenos—the romantic interest is wanting!

ἄβατον ὑπὸ χειμῶνος, 'inaccessible by reason of the climate'—the which notwithstanding it was ascended, "in defiance of the assertion of Herodotus," by Leake (cp. *Northern Greece*, iii. 295 f.), who indeed describes it as an im-

ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁρμώμενοι, ὡς ταύτην ἔσχον, κατεστρέφοντο καὶ
τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην. ἀπὸ τούτου δὴ τοῦ Περδίκκεω 139
Ἀλέξανδρος ὧδε ἐγένετο· Ἀμύντεω παῖς ἦν Ἀλέξανδρος,
Ἀμύντης δὲ Ἀλκέτεω, Ἀλκέτεω δὲ πατὴρ ἦν Ἀέροπος, τοῦ
δὲ Φίλιππος, Φιλίππου δὲ Ἀργαῖος, τοῦ δὲ Περδίκκης ὁ
κτησάμενος τὴν ἀρχήν.

---

15 ὁρμεώμενοι Cz : ὁρμεόμενοι Stein¹, van H. || ὡς ταύτην ἔσχον del. Cobet 139. 1 περδίκεω SV : περδίκαιω R 2 ὧιδε P || ἐγεγόνεε **B**z || Ἀλέξανδρος . . ἦν om. R 4 ἀργαῖος **B** : ἀραῖος Paris. 1635 z : ἀρουραῖος Marc. : αρραιος A : ἀρραῖος || περδίκης B**B** : περιδίκης C

---

portant pass between Lower and Upper Macedonia.

15. **ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁρμώμενοι**: three or rather four stages in all are indicated in the advance of the Makedonians, or Argeadai. I. Argos (Orestikon) or Orestis may be taken as the starting-point, or cradle, far up the Haliakmon, and about its sources, Upper Makedonia, the (unknown) city of Lebaia. II. The parts under Mount Bermion, Edessa, Beroia, the *ἄλλη γῆ τῆς Μακεδονίης*, near the Rose-gardens of Midas; which might be called Middle Makedonia, as no part of it touches the sea, but is generally included in Lower Makedonia. III. Lower Makedonia, *τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην*, down to the sea; cp. 7. 127 *supra*: *τὴν παρὰ θάλασσαν νῦν Μακεδονίαν* Thuc. *l.c.* Thucydides 2. 99 gives a more matter-of-fact account of the process, and in a somewhat different stratification, including the further stage, the advance to the Strymon: the two representations are not at hopeless variance. I. The tribes of the first region, the Lynkestai, Elimiotai (+ Orestai 2. 80. 6) and others *ἐπάνωθεν*, high up the country, were under native kings or chiefs, though owning the suzerainty of the 'Temenids.' II. III. This overlordship was perhaps only acquired, or reasserted by Perdikkas, the son of Alexander; cp. Thuc. 4. 83. (Aigai, Beroia,) Pieria, Bottia, were the especial acquisition of the Temenids, and the strip of Paionia along the Axios, as well as Eordaia, Almopia: in short, all the territory between the Haliakmon and the Axios, together with the sea-coast. IV. Mygdonia and the territory of the Edonians, as far as the Strymon. This region is not yet 'Makedonian' in Hdt. and was the especial acquisition of Alexander I. Cp. further, notes to 7. 127. 5 *supra*.

139. 2. **Ἀλέξανδρος ὧδε ἐγένετο**, 'the generation of Alexander was on this wise.' The pedigree of Alexander compares favourably with the Achaimenid, Perdikkas the founder ranging exactly with Achaimenes, while by the affiliation on to the Temenid and Herakleid genealogies it leaves the Achaimenid far behind. If the Makedonian genealogy be placed side by side with that of the Spartan Herakleids, Perdikkas appears almost contemporary with the kings Polydoros (Agid) and Theopompos (Eurypontid), at the epoch of the Messenian war, or *circa* 730 B.C. (7 names = *circa* 230 years). Eusebius (*Chron.* p. 169 = Diodor. 7. 16) gives only 199 years from the accession of Perdikkas to the death of Amyntas, but prefixes 101 years for the three predecessors of Perdikkas, and so reaches about 800 B.C. as the epoch of the Makedonian monarchy instead of 700 B.C.; see below. The figures in Clinton *Fasti* ii.³ 274 work out rather differently.

Ἀμύντεω: cp. 5. 17 *supra*, where Amyntas I. has something of a distinctive character, in contrast to his hot-headed son. Before him the kings, back to Perdikkas, are mere names. He is given a reign of 49 years: *ob. circa* 498 B.C.

3. **Ἀλκέτεω**: the name (Ἀλκέτας, Ἀλκέτης) appears Greek enough, and is not confined to the Makedonian pedigree, in which it frequently recurs; a Lakedaimonian of the name in Xenoph. *Hell.* 5. 4. 56. The king is given a reign of 18 years.

Ἀέροπος: on the name cp. c. 137 *supra*. He is given a reign of 20 years by the *Chronicon*. The name recurs as that of a reigning king in the fourth century, who, according to Polyain. 2. 1. 17, attempted to bar the return of Agesilaos (in 394 B.C.).

4. **Φίλιππος** is given a reign of 33

140 Ἐγεγόνεε μὲν δὴ ὧδε ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἀμύντεω· ὡς δὲ ἀπίκετο ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀποπεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Μαρδονίου, ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, Μαρδόνιος τάδε λέγει. ἐμοὶ ἀγγελίη ἥκει παρὰ βασιλέος λέγουσα οὕτω. 'Ἀθηναίοισι τὰς ἁμαρτάδας τὰς ἐς ἐμὲ ἐξ ἐκείνων γενομένας πάσας μετίημι. νῦν

---

140. 1 ὧδε: οὕτω? van H. || ὁ ante Ἀλέξανδρος om. Apr. **B**z, Holder, van H. 2 πεμφθεὶς z 4 παρὰ βασιλέος ἥκει S || ἧκε z || βασιλῆος z || οὕτως **B**: ὧδε? van H. 5 ἐξ ἐκείνων ἐς ἐμὲ **B**z, Holder || μετίειμι C

---

years. The name occurs in the family during the fifth century, cp. Thuc. 1. 57. 3 etc. (a son of Alexander), and was not uncommon elsewhere (cp. 5. 47). In the fourth century it was destined to be eclipsed only by the name Alexander itself.

Ἀργαῖος is given a reign of 31 years (Euseb. *l.c.*). The name is Greek enough, and comes near the Ἀργεάδαι, Ἀργαῖοι, or Ἀργεῖοι, who play so important a part in the whole story (cp. c. 137 *supra*). It recurs as the name of an authentic king in the fourth century: Diodor. 14. 92. 4 *ἔνιοι δέ φασι μετὰ τὴν ἔκπτωσιν τοῦ Ἀμύντου* (383 B.C.) *διετῆ χρόνον Ἀργαῖον βασιλεῦσαι τῶν Μακεδόνων, τότε δὲ Ἀμύνταν ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν.*

Περδίκκης: on the name cp. c. 137 *supra*. He is given a reign of 48 years, which would make the epoch of the kingdom 697 B.C., or *circa* 700 B.C. To this date the *Chronicon*, following the story as given in Theopompos (see c. 137 *supra*), adds 101 years (=798 B.C., or *circa* 800 B.C.), allowing Tyremmas 43 years, Koinos 28, and Karanos, the founder according to that story, 30. The pedigree here given is doubtless official, and was, perhaps, constructed for Alexander I., though the prominence of the name Perdikkas might tempt one to depress the genealogical essay to a date after the accession of Perdikkas II. The pedigree may, nevertheless, be authentic, at least in its later members. Alexander must have produced a pedigree before he was admitted to compete at Olympia (cp. my notes to 5. 22), not later than 500 B.C. But the legendary apotheosis of Perdikkas may be an afterthought; or else Alexander gave his (eldest?) son the name of the reputed Founder of the House, in order the better to publish his claims.

140. 1. **ἐγεγόνεε** practically = *ἐγένετο* c. 139 *supra*.

2. **ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας**: Hdt. throughout represents the Athenians as having re-occupied the city during the winter of 480–79 B.C.

ἔλεγε τάδε: it is not quite clear whether the scene is laid in the *Ekklesia* or in the *Boule*; but the ambassador will have addressed Council before addressing Assembly. The different meanings, or shades, in **ἔλεγε** (of the actual audible speech), **λέγει** (of the sense, or message conveyed by the speaker, at second hand), and **λέγουσα** (of the substance of a despatch or letter), are noticeable; add **λέγω** below where Mardonios speaks in person by the lips of Alexander. **ἀγγελίη** is no doubt in this case a written despatch; cp. *ἀγγελιηφόρος*.

4. **τὰς ἁμαρτάδας . . μετίημι**: there is a distinctly oriental, not to say sacerdotal ring about this phrase, and indeed the whole letter. The offer comprises six items: (i.) forgiveness, i.e. no (further) penalties or reprisals against Athens; (ii.) restoration of their land, i.e. secure tenure; (iii.) additional territory (at the expense of the Peloponnesians?); (iv.) *αὐτονομία*—no restoration of tyrants; (v.) rebuilding of the temples; (vi.) alliance (*ὁμολογέειν*: cp. *ὁμαιχμίην ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης infra*; and *φίλος*).

Whether any such despatch had been received by Mardonios or not is another question. Up above he has been represented as acting on his own initiative, or by the advice of oracles. Again, whether Alexander really delivered just this (**τάδε**) speech, or anything like it, is questionable. Baehr, while regarding the mission of Alexander as historical, says that the speeches, as reported, *e rhetorum atque sophistarum fluxisse scholis*; cp. 3. 40, 3. 80 etc.

5. **μετίημι**: cp. 6. 59 *ἐν δ' αὖ Πέρσῃσι ὁ κατιστάμενος βασιλεὺς τὸν προοφειλόμενον φόρον μετιεῖ.* But *ἁμαρτάδες* are

τε ὧδε Μαρδόνιε ποίεε· τοῦτο μὲν τὴν γῆν σφι ἀπόδος, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλην πρὸς ταύτῃ ἑλέσθων αὐτοί, ἥντινα ἂν ἐθέλωσι, ἐόντες αὐτόνομοι· ἱρά τε πάντα σφι, ἢν δὴ βούλωνταί γε ἐμοὶ ὁμολογέειν, ἀνόρθωσον, ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐνέπρησα.' τούτων δὲ ἀπιγμένων ἀναγκαίως ἔχει μοι ποιέειν ταῦτα, ἢν μὴ τὸ ὑμέτερον ἀντίον γένηται. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τάδε. νῦν τί μαίνεσθε πόλεμον βασιλέι ἀειρόμενοι; οὔτε γὰρ ἂν ὑπερβάλοισθε οὔτε οἷοί τε ἐστὲ ἀντέχειν τὸν πάντα χρόνον. εἴδετε μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ξέρξεω στρατηλασίης τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὰ ἔργα, πυνθάνεσθε δὲ καὶ τὴν νῦν παρ' ἐμοὶ ἐοῦσαν δύναμιν· ὥστε καὶ ἢν ἡμέας ὑπερβάλησθε καὶ νικήσητε, τοῦ περ ὑμῖν οὐδεμία ἐλπὶς εἴ περ εὖ φρονέετε, ἄλλη παρέσται πολλαπλησίη. μὴ ὦν βούλεσθε παρισούμενοι βασιλέι στέρεσθαι

---

6 *μαρδόνιε ὧδε* **β** || *ποίεε* V (S): *ποίε* R: *ποίει* **α**, Holder, van H. 7 *θέλωσι(ν* V) **β** 9 *τουτέων* *z* 11 *ἀντίον* Valckenaer, Holder, van H., Stein[3]: *αἴτιον* || *τάδε νῦν· τί* Bekker, van H. 12 *βασιλεῖ* **α**B || *ἀνταειρόμενοι* **β***z*, Holder, van H. || *οὔτοι γὰρ ἂν ὑπερβάλλοισθε* C 14 *τό <τε> πλῆθος* coni. Stein[1 2], adsc. van H. 15 *παρ' ἐμοὶ ἐοῦσαν* P: *παρεοῦσάν μοι* Paris. 1635 *z*: *παρ' ἐμὲ ἐοῦσάν τε καὶ*? Stein[1] || *καὶ νικήσητε* del. Cobet, van H. 16 *τοῦ* *z*: *τὸ* 17 *οὐδεμίη* *z* || *φρονέοιτε* *z* || *<ἀλλ'> ἄλλη* Cobet, Holder || *παρέστε* B || *παραπλησίη* S 18 *βούλεσθαι* B: *βούλησθε* P*z* || *παρισεύμενοι* **β** || *βασιλεῖ* AB || *ἐστερῆσθαι* maleb. van H.

---

not exactly equivalent to arrears of tribute! The debt-metaphor does not quite work: but the king 'remits' the penalties owing to him; and from the remission of penalties to the remission of 'sins' the transition is easy.

9. **τούτων**: sc. *ἀγγελιῶν*, *ἐπιστολῶν*, *ἐντολῶν*, or rather, in the neuter abstract, referring back generally to the king's orders: just like **ταῦτα** immediately below.

10. **ἀναγκαίως ἔχει μοι**, 'necessity is laid on me'—Mardonios.

ἢν μὴ τὸ ὑμέτερον ἀντίον γένηται, 'unless you should interpose an obstacle': in which case *ἀντίον* is predicative. But cp. App. Crit. The vulgate *αἴτιον* has, perhaps, been too lightly discarded: it would mean 'unless you should cause me to fail in my endeavour.' The predicative force of the possessive, and the idiomatic use of *αἴτιον* (cp. c. 7. 125. 5 *supra*) would then be noticeable.

11. **λέγω δέ**: Mardonios is still the speaker, reported by Alexander.

12. **πόλεμον βασιλέι ἀειρόμενοι**: *π. ἀείρεσθαι*, cp. 7. 132, 156—in both places with a dative. The tense here is remarkable: is the fresh campaign regarded as a fresh war, or warfare? Is not the door diplomatically opened for the Athenians to drop their arms, by the insinuation that they have not yet quite concluded taking them up?

ὑπερβάλοισθε, 'prove superior'; 7. 163, 168, c. 24 *supra*.

13. **ἀντέχειν κτλ.**, 'to withstand'—hold out against—'for ever.'

τὸν πάντα χρόνον: here future, cp. 3. 65, (4. 187, 9. 73, 106): in some cases the past, 6. 123, 9. 27 (Stein).

14. **τῆς Ξέρξεω στρατηλασίης τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὰ ἔργα**: *στρατηλασίης* appears to = *στρατοῦ*. The *στρατηλασίη* of Xerxes is one thing, that of Mardonios another. Mardonios may be supposed to be referring to Thermopylai, and the destruction of Athens by Xerxes: he cannot be supposed to have in view the naval *στρατός*. He apparently compares the immense size, and success, of Xerxes' army (*πεζὸς στρατός*) with his own reduced numbers and possible, though not probable, defeat.

μὲν τῆς χώρης, θέειν δὲ αἰεὶ περὶ ὑμέων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ καταλύσασθε· παρέχει δὲ ὑμῖν κάλλιστα [καταλύσασθαι], βασιλέος ταύτῃ ὁρμημένου· ἔστε ἐλεύθεροι, ἡμῖν ὁμαιχμίην συνθέμενοι ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης. Μαρδόνιος μὲν ταῦτα ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐνετείλατό μοι εἰπεῖν πρὸς ὑμέας· ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν εὐνοίης τῆς πρὸς ὑμέας ἐούσης ἐξ ἐμεῦ οὐδὲν λέξω, οὐ γὰρ ἂν νῦν πρῶτον ἐκμάθοιτε, προσχρηίζω δὲ ὑμέων πείθεσθαι Μαρδονίῳ. ἐνορῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν οὐκ οἵοισί τε ἐσομένοισι τὸν πάντα χρόνον πολεμέειν Ξέρξῃ· εἰ γὰρ ἐνώρων τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἄν κοτε ἐς ὑμέας ἦλθον ἔχων λόγους τούσδε· καὶ γὰρ δύναμις ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἡ βασιλέος ἐστὶ καὶ χεὶρ ὑπερμήκης. ἢν ὦν μὴ αὐτίκα ὁμολογήσητε, μεγάλα προτεινόντων ἐπ' οἷσι ὁμολογέειν ἐθέλουσι, δειμαίνω ὑπὲρ ὑμέων ἐν τρίβῳ τε

---

19 *ἑωυτέων* z 20 *καταλλάσσεσθε* z || *καταλύσασθαι* secl. Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *καταλύσασθε* V 21 . *βασιλέος* P: . *βασιλῆος* z || *ὡρμημένου* CPz || , *ἐστὲ* Pz: . *ἐστὲ* R 22 *δόλου τε* van H. 23 *εἶπαι* z, van H. 24 *ἐξ ἐμεῦ ἐούσης* **B** 25 *προσχρηίζω* **a**P: *προσχρήζω* **B**C: *προσχρῄζω* z 26 *ἐνορῶ* ACP, Stein[2], Holder: *ἐνορέω* **B**z, Stein[1], van H.: *ἐνορὼν* B[1]: *ἐνορῶν* B[2] 27 *ἐνόρων* S: *ἐνώρεον* van H. || [*τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν*]? van H. || *ἐν*: *ἐνὸν* z 28 *τοιούσδε* z 29 *βασιλῆος* z 30 *ὦν*: *οὖν* C: om. **B** || *ἐπ' οἷσι*: *ἐποίσει* **B**

---

19. **θέειν**: cp. *πολλάκις ἀγῶνας δραμέονται* c. 102 *supra*.

21. **ταύτῃ ὁρμημένου**, 'having taken the initiative in that way,' as aforesaid. (*Cum haec regis sit voluntas*, Baehr.)

ὁμαιχμίην: cp. 7. 145 *supra*. The offer is of distinct alliance, with liberty intact (**ἔστε ἐλεύθεροι**).

22. **ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης**: a standing formula of Hellenic or international diplomacy; cp. 1. 69, and in actual treaty texts *ap*. Thuc. 4. 118. 1 (*ἀδόλως καὶ ἀδεῶς κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους*); 5. 18. 9 (*δικαίως καὶ ἀδόλως*); 5. 23 *bis* (*δικαίως καὶ προθύμως καὶ ἀδόλως*); 5. 47. 8 (*δικαίως καὶ ἀβλαβῶς καὶ ἀδόλως*). *δόλος* must be the same word as the Latin *dolus*; cp. L. & S. The proceedings for 'striking a treaty' as reported in Livy 1. 24 (*sine fraude mea, sine dolo malo*, etc.) might suggest that the formula was very ancient.

23. **ἐγὼ δέ**: Alexander, *propria persona*.

24. **εὐνοίης**: a thoroughly Attic formula; cp. complimentary decrees *passim*.

οὐ γὰρ ἂν νῦν πρῶτον ἐκμάθοιτε must mean, not 'I have often spoken of it before,' but 'you have had many practical proofs of it.' As to the fact cp. note above, c. 136.

26. **ἐνορῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν**: the construction appears to be determined by the preposition; cp. just below *εἰ γὰρ ἐνώρων τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν*. Cp. *συνειδέναι*.

29. **χεὶρ ὑπερμήκης**: the youngest son, the successor of Xerxes, was known to later tradition as *μακρόχειρ*, i.e. the word is found in Plutarch *Artax*. 1 *μακρόχειρ ἐπεκαλεῖτο τὴν δεξιὰν μείζονα τῆς ἑτέρας ἔχων*. But the statement perhaps rests merely on a metaphor misunderstood: *χείρ = δύναμις*, e.g. 4. 155. Ovid *Her*. 17. 166 *an nescis longas regibus esse manus?* Pollux 2. 151 *ἑκατόνχειρ, μακρόχειρ, εἴτε κατὰ Πολύκλειτον ὁ Ὑστάσπου Δαρεῖος, εἴτε κατὰ Ἀντιλέοντα Ξέρξης, εἴτε κατὰ τοὺς πλείστους Ὦχος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Ἀρταξέρξης ἤτοι τὴν δεξιὰν ἔχων προμηκεστέραν ἢ τὴν ἀριστερὰν ἢ ἀμφοτέρας· οἱ δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐξέτεινεν.*

30. **μεγάλα**, 'advantageous to you.'

προτεινόντων: sc. *τῶν Περσέων*.

31. **ἐν τρίβῳ τε κτλ.** Alexander is made to describe the Athenians as (i.) dwelling on the highway (*ἐν τρίβῳ*), that is, in the most exposed situation; (ii.)

μάλιστα οἰκημένων τῶν συμμάχων πάντων αἰεί τε φθειρομένων μούνων, ἐξαίρετον μεταίχμιόν τε τὴν γῆν ἐκτημένων. ἀλλὰ πείθεσθε· πολλοῦ γὰρ ὑμῖν ἄξια ταῦτα, εἰ βασιλεύς γε ὁ μέγας μούνοισι ὑμῖν Ἑλλήνων τὰς ἁμαρτάδας ἀπιεὶς ἐθέλει φίλος γενέσθαι."

Ἀλέξανδρος μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεξε. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ πυθόμενοι **141** *ἥκειν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐς Ἀθήνας ἐς ὁμολογίην ἄξοντα τῷ βαρβάρῳ Ἀθηναίους, ἀναμνησθέντες τῶν λογίων ὥς σφεας*

33 *μοῦνον* C: 'post hoc in libris non dividitur' Stein || *ἐξαίρετον μεταίχμιόν τε* CV, Stein, Holder: *ἐξαίρετον· μεταίχμιόν τε* ABP: *ἐξαίρετον· τὲ μεταίχμιον* R: *ἐξαίρετον, μεταίχμιόν τε* S: *μεταίχμιον* tantum Marc.: *ἐξαίρετόν τι μεταίχμιον* z, van H. || *ἐκτημένων* z: *κεκτημένων* 34 *πίθεσθε* Cobet 35 *ἀφιεὶς* P: *ἀφεὶς* **a**C || *θέλει* **B** **141.** 1 *τοσαῦτα* **B** 2 *ἐς Ἀθηναίους* C 3 *ὡς σφέας* R, van H.

bearing (or likely to bear) all the brunt of the war alone; (iii.) their territory being the natural battle-field, or debatable ground, between the contending armies (Persian, Peloponnesian). The description applies fairly well to Attica, which during this war was twice invaded and devastated, and had been the scene of the great naval battle, to say nothing of Marathon, ten years earlier; but in a general way, and throughout Greek history, Boiotia would better answer to the description (cp. 9. 2. 3 *infra*), and even in this war it was north of Kithairon that the *ἐξαίρετον μεταίχμιον* was to be found. The phrase here perhaps expresses the Athenian sense of their special sufferings in the common cause (*τῶν συμμάχων πάντων*).

33. **ἀλλά**: with the imperative, to cut short the question; cp. L. & S. *sub v.* II. 2.

34. **ταῦτα** might seem to refer to what follows (*εἰ βασιλεύς γε κτλ.*), which, however, reproduces the preceding offers. **ὁ μέγας** is an unusual addition, but a (lesser) king is speaking.

141. 1. **Λακεδαιμόνιοι δέ κτλ.** If any part of the story of Alexander's embassy could have come from other than an Athenian source, it is not this chapter, which positively reeks Atticism. The solidarity of the story as a whole carries the Attic source for every part.

πυθόμενοι: who let them know? Their friends in Athens? Themistokles?

2. **τῷ βαρβάρῳ** with **ὁμολογίην**. Baehr cps. 7. 169 *τὰ Μενελέῳ τιμωρήματα*.

3. **ἀναμνησθέντες τῶν λογίων**: what oracles were these which they now recalled to mind? Blakesley detects herein the oracles found by Kleomenes in the Akropolis (in 511 B.C.) 5. 90, and further suggests that they were fabrications by Onomakritos (cp. 7. 6 *supra*). But was such a prediction, as is here reported, likely to have been formulated so early as that? Or is the added motive, based upon these supposed oracles, required to account for the action of the Lakedaimonians on this occasion? Onomakritos may have been the author of these *λόγια*, but, if so, their fabrication was probably of later date, and they were perhaps part of the artillery brought to bear upon the Athenians to procure their medism, not Lakedaimonian reminiscences of discoveries thirty years old.

In any case this prediction is precious: prophecies fulfilled are sweet, but those unfulfilled are sweeter, to the historian; their authenticity is so much more obvious. The unfulfilled prediction, besides, makes room for some fulfilment of prediction. The extreme precision of the present instance raises it to the level of a maxim of policy, cp. c. 62 *supra*.

The expulsion of the Lakedaimonians and all the other Dorians to boot from the Peloponnesos by the Medes and Athenians, i.e. the complete reversal of the Dorian conquest and its effects, was not a bad idea to conjure with, and has rather a Themistoklean touch about it: perhaps it was not an offer made by Mardonios to attract the Athenians, but a bogle devised in Athens to terrify the Spartans. It might at least suggest

χρεόν ἐστι ἅμα τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Δωριεῦσι ἐκπίπτειν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου ὑπὸ Μήδων τε καὶ Ἀθηναίων, κάρτα τε ἔδεισαν μὴ ὁμολογήσωσι τῷ Πέρσῃ Ἀθηναῖοι, αὐτίκα τέ σφι ἔδοξε πέμπειν ἀγγέλους. καὶ δὴ συνέπιπτε ὥστε ὁμοῦ σφεων γίνεσθαι τὴν κατάστασιν· ἐπανέμειναν γὰρ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι διατρίβοντες, εὖ ἐπιστάμενοι ὅτι ἔμελλον Λακεδαιμόνιοι πεύσεσθαι ἥκοντα παρὰ τοῦ βαρβάρου ἄγγελον ἐπ' ὁμολογίῃ, πυθόμενοί τε πέμψειν κατὰ τάχος ἀγγέλους. ἐπίτηδες ὦν ἐποίευν, ἐνδεικνύμενοι τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι τὴν ἑωυτῶν
142 γνώμην. ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λέγων Ἀλέξανδρος, διαδεξάμενοι ἔλεγον οἱ ἀπὸ Σπάρτης ἄγγελοι "ἡμέας δὲ ἔπεμψαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι δεησομένους ὑμέων μήτε νεώτερον ποιέειν μηδὲν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα μήτε λόγους ἐνδέκεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ βαρβάρου. οὔτε γὰρ δίκαιον οὐδαμῶς οὔτε κόσμον φέρον οὔτε γε ἄλλοισι Ἑλλήνων οὐδαμοῖσι, ὑμῖν δὲ δὴ καὶ διὰ πάντων ἥκιστα πολλῶν εἵνεκα. ἠγείρατε γὰρ τόνδε τὸν πόλεμον ὑμεῖς οὐδὲν

---

4 χρεών CPz, van H. || ἐκ: ἀπὸ **β** 5 τε post κάρτα om. S(V) 6 δέ σφι(ἵν V) **β** || ἔδοξεν AB ap. Stein[1]: ἔδοξε **α**: ἔδοξεν **β** ap. Holder 7 σφέων BCz 10 ἐπομολογίην C 11 πειθόμενοί R **142.** 5 φέρων R || οὔτι γε Werfer: γε om. **β** ('locus vix sanus' van H.) 6 δὴ om. S 7 ἐγείρατε z || τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε **β**: (πόλεμον τόνδε absque τὸν S ap. Gaisf.) || ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν ὑμέων C

---

possibilities in the future: but what of Argos as the king's best friend? 7. 150 ff. Perhaps the whole notion really belongs to the later date, and the time of Themistokles' medism. The patriotic (i.e. Attic) aspects of that *gran rifiuto* were never allowed to emerge in the Themistoklean legend; and Athenian tradition was quite capable of ignoring the true and original connexion of this prophecy, and utilizing it in the present connexion, where it is materially and even grammatically *de trop.*

6. **ἔδοξε**: here of a formal decision.

7. **ἀγγέλους** = πρέσβεις: cp. 7. 1.

καὶ δή: each particle has its full and ordinary sense.

συνέπιπτε ὥστε: cp. c. 15 *supra*; it was a coincidence, but not an undesigned one: **ἐπίτηδες ἐποίευν** just below. This latter verb may represent ἐπανέμειναν (so Stein), an abstract idiom, corresponding to the use of our verb 'do,' 'did' (which would, however, require an express object, however abstract: 'this they were doing').

8. **κατάστασιν**: in the same sense 3. 46; in a different one, c. 83 *supra.*

12. **ἐνδεικνύμενοι**, 'displaying'; cp. Thuc. 4. 126. ὁ τὸ εὔψυχον ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεῖ ὀξεῖς ἐνδείκνυνται.

142. 1. **διαδεξάμενοι**: exactly as in Plato *Rep.* 576 B Ἀνάγκη, ἔφη διαδεξάμενος τὸν λόγον ὁ Γλαύκων. Cp. διάδοχος, διαδοχή.

2. **ἡμέας δέ**: the conjunction is noticeable; here it might almost suggest a suppressed clause: Ἀλέξανδρον μέν κτλ. Cp. 5. 109 ἡμέας δὲ ἀπέπεμψε.

3. **νεώτερον ποιέειν** (τι 5. 35), to do something newer, too new, outrageous, etc., perhaps not a mere euphemism, but an implicit plea for the maxim *stare super antiquas vias*; and so probably in the first instance referring not to foreign but to domestic affairs. Its use here might be taken to hint that a schism in the Greek ranks would be of the nature of στάσις (cp. c. 3 *supra*).

4. **λόγους ἐνδέκεσθαι**: 7. 236 *supra.*

5. **κόσμον φέρον**: cp. c. 60 *supra.*

6. **διὰ πάντων**: cp. c. 37 *supra.*

7. **ἠγείρατε . . οὐδὲν ἡμέων βουλομένων**: a statement quite inconsistent with the alleged outrage at Sparta upon the Persian heralds, 7. 133 *supra.* If

ἡμέων βουλομένων, καὶ περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρης ἀρχῆθεν ὁ ἀγὼν ἐγένετο, νῦν δὲ φέρει καὶ ἐς πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα· ἄλλως τε τούτων ἁπάντων, αἰτίους γενέσθαι δουλοσύνης τοῖσι Ἕλλησι Ἀθηναίους οὐδαμῶς ἀνασχετόν, οἵτινες αἰεὶ καὶ τὸ πάλαι φαίνεσθε πολλοὺς ἐλευθερώσαντες ἀνθρώπων. πιεζευμένοισι μέντοι ὑμῖν συναχθόμεθα, καὶ ὅτι καρπῶν ἐστερήθητε διξῶν

8 *βουλευομένων* AB ap. Stein[1]: *βουλομένων* **α**: *βουλευομένων* **β** ap. Holder || *ἀρχῆθεν* Wesseling, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *ἀρχὴν* Schaefer: *ἀρχῆς* 9 *ἄλλως τε*: *ἄλλως τε ἄνευ* Reiske: *πάρεξ τε* vel *χωρίς τε* coni. Stein[2]: *αἰτίους, αἰτίους* de Pauw: 'An delenda verba *τούτων ἁπάντων*?' van H. 10 *τουτέων* **β**z || *πάντων* **β**: *ἀπαντώντων* Schaefer, Schweighaeuser 11 *καὶ*: *κατὰ* z 12 *πιεζομένοισι* BCz, van H. 13 *ἐστέρησθε* z

we are to go back to the Athenian challenge in 5. 96, why not to the Spartan 'Hands off' message in 1. 152?

8. **περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρης ἀρχῆθεν ὁ ἀγὼν ἐγένετο**: sc. *γῆς*. Cp. the words of Themistokles to the Ionians c. 22 *supra*: *ἀρχῆθεν ἡ ἔχθρη πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον ἀπ' ὑμέων ἡμῖν γέγονε*. The Athenian responsibility is probably conceived as going back to 498 B.C. and the despatch of the twenty ships to Sardes, which were *ἀρχὴ κακῶν Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι* 5. 97. The beautiful anachronism *ἀρχῆς* can hardly be maintained, or it would be extremely serviceable. Blakesley and Rawlinson indeed would maintain it on the ground that one anachronism is already involved in ascribing to the Athenians in 479 B.C. such services on behalf of freedom as are predicated of them in the context: "up to this time they had never taken any part in liberating any nation." But the Athenians would have cited the cases of (1) Plataia, (2) the Ionians, (3) Marathon, to say nothing of more legendary exploits. Cp. 9. 27 *infra*; and *αἰεὶ καὶ τὸ πάλαι* in any case refutes R.'s argument. Baehr also defends *ἀρχῆς, quod ipsa sententia loci requirere . . videtur*. Cp. App. Crit. If maintained, it would of course be an afterthought tending to bring down the composition of this speech after the Thirty Years' Truce: a date before which the term *ἀρχή* will hardly have been used of the Athenian *Symmachia*.

9. **φέρει . . ἐς**, reaches, is threatening, concerns, affects.

ἄλλως τε τούτων ἁπάντων: a desperate crux. Stein[5] boldly takes *ἄλλως* as = *χωρίς*, though such a use of *ἄλλως* (he admits) is unprecedented; in 3. 8 (which he cites) *ἀμφοτέρων αὐτῶν* seems to be constructed with *ἐν μέσῳ* rather than with *ἄλλος*. For the various emendations, none of them satisfactory, cp. App. Crit. If the prepositional use of *ἄλλως* is rejected, *τούτων ἁπάντων* might be taken 'of all Hellenes' (that the Athenians, etc.), *τούτων* referring to *πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα* just before; but *τοῖσι Ἕλλησι* just after rather militates against this rendering. The repetition of **αἰτίους** is very neat; but *τούτων ἁπάντων* would involve tasteless exaggeration in that case. *ἀπαντώντων* makes a very poor sense. The insertion of *ἄνευ* or *χωρίς* (as in 9. 26, 3. 82) gives a good sense, and an Herodotean formula, but the omission is not easy to account for palaeographically.

11. **ἀνασχετόν**: cp. 7. 163, and *ἀνέχεσθαι tolerare* 7. 87, 149 etc. **οἵτινες** causal, 'seeing that ye . .'

12. **ἀνθρώπων** is here used 'without prejudice'; for instances see 8 above.

13. **συναχθόμεθα**, 'we sympathize with'; the word is common in Xenophon and the orators of the fourth century, but this appears to be the only place where it is found in any earlier writer. The double **καὶ ὅτι** gives an air of precision to the statements, which are not in reality exact co-ordinates; cp. below.

καρπῶν ἐστερήθητε διξῶν ἤδη. This assertion raises a slight chronological difficulty: the scene is laid at Athens in the winter or early spring of 479 B.C. How have the Athenians already lost two harvests? Are they the harvests of two years, or the two harvests of one year? Presumably the former: but if so, the years being 480, 479 B.C., how had the Athenians already lost the harvest

ἤδη καὶ ὅτι οἰκοφθόρησθε χρόνον ἤδη πολλόν. ἀντὶ τούτων δὲ ὑμῖν Λακεδαιμόνιοί τε καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι ἐπαγγέλλονται γυναῖκάς τε καὶ τὰ ἐς πόλεμον ἄχρηστα οἰκετέων ἐχόμενα πάντα ἐπιθρέψειν, ἔστ' ἂν ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε συνεστήκῃ. μηδὲ ὑμέας Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδὼν ἀναγνώσῃ, λεήνας τὸν Μαρδονίου λόγον. τούτῳ μὲν γὰρ ταῦτα ποιητέα ἐστί· τύραννος γὰρ ἐὼν τυράννῳ συγκατεργάζεται· ὑμῖν δὲ οὐ

14 τουτέων z 15 οἱ λοιποὶ σύμμαχοι B 16 γυναῖκάς τε καὶ secl. van H. || πάντα οἰκετέων ἐχόμενα P1 17 ἐσταν AB || συνέστηκε S || μὴ δὲ libri 20 <ἀρχὴν> συγκατεργάζεται ? van H. || δὲ: δέ γε B, Holder

of 479? Had they failed to follow the directions of Themistokles *σπόρου ἀνακῶς ἔχειν* c. 109 *supra*, and so lost a harvest by anticipation? Or is not the expression here really a slight anachronism, the two harvests which the Athenians ultimately lost, one in 480 B.C. by the devastation of Xerxes, the other in 479 B.C. by the devastation of Mardonios, having been 'telescoped' by the writer (or his source) in the light of later events, from the point of view of the hypothetical orator? (The anachronism remains the same if Archontic years are understood; or, for that matter, Spartan.) The apparent co-ordination of the aorist (**ἐστερήθητε**) and the perfect (**οἰκοφθόρησθε**) is grammatically interesting; yet a shade of difference belongs to them. The *καρπῶν στέρησις* is a precise and limited fact; the *οἰκοφθορία* is a process, which, though now perfectly complete, has been a long time going on. Thus the tenses of the two verbs here could not be simply interchanged without a loss of significance.

14. **ἀντὶ τούτων δέ**: the *δέ* is emphatic; cp. 1. 2 *supra*, 'in return therefor'—to compensate or console you.

15. **Λακεδαιμόνιοί τε καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι**: i.e. the Peloponnesians; it may include Aigina and Megara, but at least the Athenians are conceived as excluded from the title: this is a symmachy within the symmachy *ἐπὶ τῷ Μήδῳ*.

ἐπαγγέλλονται, 'make you this offer'; cp. 7. 1.

16. **γυναῖκάς τε καὶ . . οἰκετέων ἐχόμενα**: *οἰκ. ἐχ.* = *οἰκέτας* c. 144 *infra*; cp. cc. 44, 106 *supra*. This phrase here is an elaborate periphrasis; cp. 1. 120, 193. The children are of course included, as **ἐπι-θρέψειν** would also suggest.

17. **ἔστ' ἂν ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε συνεστήκῃ**: for the phrase (*συστῆναι*) cp. 7. 144, 225, 'while, so long as, this war obtain.' The perfect subjunctive is noticeable, but the word is only 'perfect' in grammatical form, and practically present, or rather aoristic, in sense.

18. **λεήνας**: cp. 7. 10 *supra*.

20. **τύραννος γὰρ ἐὼν τυράννῳ συγκατεργάζεται**: an obvious gnome, probably much older than the ostensible occasion, and perhaps even inherited from 'the age of the Despots.' Not but what tyrant at times would work not with but against his fellow. 'Birds of a feather fly together,' 'thieves work in pairs,' etc. etc., were proverbs a little hard on Alexander and Mardonios. Alexander was not a 'tyrant' in the proper sense (cp. c. 137 *supra*), and Mardonios was not technically a 'tyrant' at all. The gnome might have worked better, especially as illustrating the co-operation of the tyranny and the Mede, if applied to the Ionians on the Ister (4. 137 f.), or Hippias at Sardes (5. 96), or the Greek exiles in the train of Xerxes (7. 6 *supra*). The point here, however, put forward is not primarily the connexion of 'medism' and 'tyranny,' but the tendency of tyrant to stand by tyrant against the Republics. The Republics, Sparta herself, did not go into this matter with clean hands: she had worked for the restoration of Hippias (5. 91), she would have accepted the aid of Gelon upon conditions (7. 157 *supra*), as she was afterwards glad to accept the aid of Dionysios, or for that matter of Persia itself. But there is a certain amount of truth in the solidarity of constitutional sentiment. All states are forced from time to time into strange

ποιητέα, εἴ περ εὖ τυγχάνετε φρονέοντες, ἐπισταμένοισι ὡς βαρβάροισι ἐστὶ οὔτε πιστὸν οὔτε ἀληθὲς οὐδέν." ταῦτα ἔλεξαν οἱ ἄγγελοι.

Ἀθηναῖοι *δὲ πρὸς μὲν* Ἀλέξανδρον *ὑπεκρίναντο τάδε.* **143**
"*καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦτό γε ἐπιστάμεθα ὅτι πολλαπλησίη ἐστὶ τῷ* Μήδῳ *δύναμις ἤ περ ἡμῖν, ὥστε οὐδὲν δέει τοῦτό γε ὀνειδίζειν. ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐλευθερίης γλιχόμενοι ἀμυνεύμεθα οὕτω ὅκως ἂν καὶ δυνώμεθα. ὁμολογῆσαι δὲ τῷ βαρβάρῳ μήτε σὺ ἡμέας πειρῶ ἀναπείθειν οὔτε ἡμεῖς πεισόμεθα. νῦν τε ἀπάγγελλε* Μαρδονίῳ [*ὡς* Ἀθηναῖοι *λέγουσι*], *ἔστ' ἂν ὁ ἥλιος τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἴῃ τῇ*

---

21 *τυγχάνεται* R : *τυγχάνεσθε* P 22 *βαρβάροισι ἐστὶ* P, Stein[2] : *βαρβάροισί ἐστι* **α**, Stein[1], Holder, van H. : *βαρβάροισιν ἔστιν* R (*βαρβάροισιν ἐστιν* **β** ap. Holder) **143.** 1 *τοιάδε* **β** 2 *γε* om. R || *τῶν μήδων* **β** 4 *ἐλευθερίην σκεπτόμενοι* **β**P (in marg. corr.) *z* || *ἀμύνεσθαι* C || *οὕτως* AB ap. Stein : *οὕτω* **α** : *οὕτως* **β** ap. Holder || *καὶ* om. **β** 6 *ἡμέες z* || *τε* : *δὲ* RSV 7 *ὡς* Ἀθηναῖοι *λέγουσι* del. Cobet, Holder, van H., Stein[3] || *εστὰν* AB || *τῇ* : *τὴν* Cobet, van H.

---

or unnatural alliances by necessity or interest: nor is identity of constitution between neighbours any great security for peace. Monarchy will war against Monarchy, Republic against Republic, for the sake of territory, or commerce, or honour, or adventure, or existence, and will seek or accept any alliance that may serve its turn; but still all the same one form of constitution has an 'elective affinity' for its like, and other things being equal, tolerates or co-operates with it more easily. A *Bundes-staat* could never arise between states of diverse constitution, and it may be doubted whether diversely constituted units can permanently maintain a *Staaten-Bund.*

22. **βαρβάροισι ἐστὶ οὔτε πιστὸν οὔτε ἀληθὲς οὐδέν.** Is this monstrous utterance in place here as a common Hellenic sentiment? Or is it put into the mouth of the speaker as a satirical sample of Spartan philosophy? Does it simply prepare the way for the magnificent pan-Hellenism of the Athenian reply? Does it reflect upon the subsequent duplicity and bad faith of the Spartans themselves? It is certainly not the opinion of the historian, whether he has taken it over from his source or dramatically devised it to give point to the piece: his whole work belies it, and in particular his account of Persian *παιδεία*, 1. 136.

143. 3. **οὐδὲν δέει,** 'thou needest not . .' The form (midd. indic. pr. 2nd person) is not noticed by L. & S.

4. **γλιχόμενοι:** cp. *γλίχεαι* (*ὡς* . .) 7. 161; *γλιχομένοισι περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίης* 2. 102. The participial construction is here equivalent to a dependent sentence: *quia* etc.

ἀμυνεύμεθα is, of course, future; **ὅκως ἄν** after *οὕτω* appears not as a final but rather as a relative, to which **οὕτω** is antecedent. The correlation is "frequent in poetry, but less so in prose," Madvig § 310. Cp. Plato *Phaed.* 115 C *ταῦτα μὲν τοίνυν προθυμηθησόμεθα, ἔφη, οὕτω ποιεῖν· θάπτωμεν δέ σε τίνα τρόπον; Ὅπως ἄν, ἔφη, βούλησθε, ἐάνπερ γε λάβητέ με καὶ μὴ ἐκφύγω ὑμᾶς.*

5. **μήτε . . οὔτε:** the forms of the negative are determined by the moods; so below *μήκοτε* follows the imperative.

7. **ἔστ' ἂν ὁ ἥλιος τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἴῃ τῇ περ καὶ νῦν ἔρχεται:** is the path from east to west (and *vice versa*) or from south to north (and *vice versa*), or, more generally, both the daily and annual paths intended? When Hdt. came to write 'the Egyptian *Logoi*' he had ceased to regard the sun as a safe fixture, and could hardly have taken its annual course as a symbol of *τὰ μὴ ἐνδεχόμενα ἄλλως ἔχειν.* Cp. 2. 24–26. He would rather, perhaps, have taken the rising and setting of the sun as a perfect certainty; yet cp. 2. 142. In any case,

περ καὶ νῦν ἔρχεται, μήκοτε ὁμολογήσειν ἡμέας Ξέρξῃ· ἀλλὰ θεοῖσί τε συμμάχοισι πίσυνοί μιν ἐπέξιμεν ἀμυνόμενοι καὶ τοῖσι ἥρωσι, τῶν ἐκεῖνος οὐδεμίαν ὄπιν ἔχων ἐνέπρησε τούς τε

---

8 *περ* om. **a**C 9 *πίσσυνοί* **B** 10 *οὐδὲ μίαν ὄπιν* **a** : *ὄπιν οὐδεμίην* **B** : *οὐδεμίην ὄπιν* z || *ἐνέπρησέ τε τοὺς* S

---

however, this proverbial appeal to the Uniformity of Nature would remain dramatically available: Hdt. is not speaking *propria persona*. Stein[5] happily cps. Sophokl. *Philokt.* 1329 ff. :

καὶ παῦλαν ἴσθι τῆσδε μή ποτ' ἐντυχεῖν
νόσου βαρείας, ὡς ἂν αὑτὸς ἥλιος
ταύτῃ μὲν αἴρῃ, τῇδε δ' αὖ δύνῃ πάλιν—

and as another symbol of eternal fixity, the relative position of earth and stars, from Euripides, *Fr.* 688 (Nauck) :

πρόσθε γὰρ κάτω
γῆς εἶσιν ἄστρα, γῆ δ' ἄνεισ' ἐς αἰθέρα
πρὶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ σοι θῶπ' ἀπαντῆσαι λόγον.

Herodotus makes a Korinthian orator employ a less dignified symbol, with a similar point, 5. 92.

This grand boast of the Athenians belongs to the pre-Periklean period: it would have sounded rather silly within sight of 'the Treaty of Kallias,' cp. 7. 151 *supra*, even though that *ὁμολογία* was not concluded with Xerxes, or not concluded at all. War *à outrance* is still the *mot d'ordre* of the day when Hdt. first drafted this history; cp. 7. 11 *supra*.

9. **θεοῖσί τε συμμάχοισι . . καὶ τοῖσι ἥρωσι**: not the Spartans, etc. (*συμμάχοισι* predicative). The gods and heroes figure but to a small extent in the actual story of the Great Invasion. The legend of Marathon was more deeply saturated with the supernatural *motif*, or at least with its symbolical outcome in actual epiphanies (cp. Hdt. IV.–VI. App. X.). No doubt at the time the Athenians looked for divine assistance, according to their lights (cp. 7. 140, 189, c. 64 *supra*), and afterwards believed themselves to have received it in large measure (cc. 13, 65, 109, 121 *supra*); but the actual battles of the war go off without much active interposition (c. 94 *supra* unique) from above: the great gods of Themistokles were Persuasion and Force (c. 108 *supra*); the supernatural machinery of the story, so far as it exists, is mainly an afterthought (7. 12 etc.), or an apology (cc. 35 ff. *supra*). Cp. Introduction, § 11.

μιν ἐπέξιμεν ἀμυνόμενοι. Is **μιν** acc. with the participle (as Stein and Sitzler take it) or with the primary verb? The construction of *ἐπέξειμι* is very various. *ἐπεξῄισαν* 7. 223 *supra* is used absolutely: where a personal object is expressed it is usually in the dative, whether the verb be used in the martial or in the legal sense, but an accus. of the person is found e.g. Antiphon 1. 11 *ἀπηγγέλθη ὅτι ἐπεξίοιμι τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν φονέα*, cp. also Eurip. *Androm.* 735 *τήνδ'* (sc. *πόλιν*) *ἐπεξελθεῖν θέλω*, and therefore cannot be pronounced impossible here. The *accus. rei* is more common; e.g. Hdt. 1. 5 *ὁμοίως σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών*: Plato *Rep.* 437 *πάσας τὰς τοιαύτας ἀμφισβητήσεις ἐπεξιόντες* (Thuc. 1. 84. 3, 3. 82. 8 are not conclusive). A sole reference of **μιν** to the participle here is harsh, considering the order of the words; but the participle and verb may be conceived as coalescing into a single idea ('we shall resolutely resist him'), and the accus. may be taken as governed by the whole verbal phrase. Strictly speaking *ἐπέξ. ἀμ.* is an *oxymoron*, or a precise formula for 'the offensive defensive.'

10. **τῶν . . τὰ ἀγάλματα.** The relative **τῶν** may be constructed both with **ὄπιν** and with **οἴκους κτλ.** *ὄπις*, a strictly poetic word, recurs 9. 76 *infra*. (Homer uses the word only of the divine action, vengeance, punishment, *θεῶν*, more frequently in the *Od.*, and even absolutely, *bis*, 14. 82, 88.) Pindar employs the word for the favourable regard of the gods for man (*Pyth.* 8. 101), but also for human regard (not for the gods but for humanity), *Ol.* 2. 6, *Isth.* 4. (5.) 58. The acc. *ὄπιδα* is also found (e.g. *Od.* 20. 215).

On the Persian destruction of holy places and objects cp. cc. 33, 35, 53, 109 *supra*; the Athenians were naturally very sore on this subject (though their losses turned out a blessing in disguise),

οἴκους καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα. σύ τε τοῦ λοιποῦ λόγους ἔχων τοιούσδε μὴ ἐπιφαίνεο Ἀθηναίοισι, μηδὲ δοκέων χρηστὰ ὑπουργέειν ἀθέμιστα ἔρδειν παραίνεε· οὐ γὰρ σὲ βουλόμεθα οὐδὲν ἄχαρι πρὸς Ἀθηναίων παθεῖν ἐόντα πρόξεινόν τε καὶ φίλον." πρὸς μὲν Ἀλέξανδρον ταῦτα ὑπεκρίναντο, πρὸς δὲ **144**
τοὺς ἀπὸ Σπάρτης ἀγγέλους τάδε. "τὸ μὲν δεῖσαι Λακεδαιμονίους μὴ ὁμολογήσωμεν τῷ βαρβάρῳ, κάρτα ἀνθρωπήιον ἦν· ἀτὰρ αἰσχρῶς γε οἴκατε ἐξεπιστάμενοι τὸ Ἀθηναίων φρόνημα ἀρρωδῆσαι, ὅτι οὔτε χρυσός ἐστι γῆς οὐδαμόθι τοσοῦτος οὔτε χώρη κάλλεϊ καὶ ἀρετῇ μέγα ὑπερφέρουσα, τὰ ἡμεῖς δεξάμενοι ἐθέλοιμεν ἂν μηδίσαντες καταδουλῶσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα. πολλά

---

12 *μὴ δὲ* ABPz 13 *ἀθέμιτα* Marc. || *ἐρδειν* A : *ῥέζειν* **B** : *ἔρδειν* z, van H. 14 *παθέειν* **B** **144.** 1 *ὑπεκρίνατο* RV 3 *κάρτα μὲν* **B** 4 *γε* om. Apr. 6 *χώρηι* B || *κάλλει* AB || *μεγάλῃ* S

---

and take no account of the offer to restore at the king's expense.

11. **τοῦ λοιποῦ**: sc. *χρόνου*.

13. **ὑπουργέειν**: sc. *ἡμῖν*, cp. c. 110 *supra*, and 7. 38.

ἀθέμιστα ἔρδειν has a poetical ring; cp. 7. 33 *supra*. **ἄχαρι**, an Herodotean euphemism, cp. 7. 36.

14. **πρόξεινόν τε καὶ φίλον**: cp. c. 136 *supra*. The phrase here has, of course, no more evidential value than there. It would be odd for the Athenians to be recognizing not merely the *προξενία* but the *φιλία* of Alexander under such circumstances. The *φιλία* probably dated after the war, when Alexander turned against the Persians (ps.-Dem. 12. 21). But Lykurgos, the orator, *c. Leocr.* § 71, in representing Alexander on this occasion as having narrowly escaped death by stoning at the hands of the Athenians, has confused this affair with that of Lykidas 9. 4 *infra*.

144. 3. **ἦν**: the imperfect here is idiomatic. *ἐστί* would obviously be admissible.

4. **ἀτάρ**, or *αὐτάρ* (Homer), a strong adversative: comparatively rare in prose, outside Hdt. (Xenoph., Plato). In 4. 188, 5. 66, as here, it answers to a preceding *μέν*.

αἰσχρῶς with *ἀρρωδῆσαι*, and **ὅτι** after *φρόνημα*. The further construction is not quite regular: **τοσοῦτος** would naturally be accompanied by *οὕτω* (*ἀρετῇ ὑπερφέρουσα*) and followed by *ὥστε*, with infinitive. The place of the final sentence is taken by the relative (*τά*) and conditional (*ἄν*). The neuter relative is also observable, the antecedents being *χρυσός* and *χώρη*. **κάλλος** and **ἀρετή** of the land refer to its appearance and its inherent virtues; cp. 7. 5 *supra*. In Plato *Charm.* 157 E the same collocation of words referring to an *οἰκία* (family) is based upon the beauty and valour of the members. It would have been interesting to have had *κάλλος* here more fully defined.

6. **ὑπερφέρουσα**, 'surpassing'; cp. c. 138 *supra*. **μέγα**, adverbial ('far').

7. **μηδίσαντες καταδουλῶσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα**: there is only too much point in the participle; the Athenian *ἀρχή* was originally based upon opposition to Persia, but opposition to Persia did not preclude *καταδουλῶσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα*—rather it furnished the means and excuse therefor. This passage reads so naïvely that it looks early; not like an apology on the part of the *τυραννὸς πόλις* of the age of Perikles, but rather like a bid for the hegemony of a free Hellas. According to Plutarch (*Aristeid.* 10) it was Aristeides who dictated this answer; the ascription is at least *ben trovato.* Themistokles would hardly have 'given away' the actual situation so completely. He is, indeed, conspicuous by his absence on this occasion. He would hardly have dismissed the Spartans with an official inventory of *τὰ διακωλύοντα* and a simple request *στρατιὴν ὡς τάχιστα ἐκπέμψαι.* Plutarch (*l.c.*) also records a further act of Aristeides calculated to make Sparta's assurance doubly sure: *ἔτι δὲ ἀρὰς θέσθαι τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἔγραψεν, εἴ τις ἐπικηρυκεύσαιτο Μήδοις ἢ τὴν συμμα-*

τε γὰρ καὶ μεγάλα ἐστὶ τὰ διακωλύοντα ταῦτα μὴ ποιέειν μηδ' ἢν ἐθέλωμεν, πρῶτα μὲν καὶ μέγιστα τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα ἐμπεπρησμένα τε καὶ συγκεχωσμένα, τοῖσι ἡμέας ἀναγκαίως ἔχει τιμωρέειν ἐς τὰ μέγιστα μᾶλλον ἤ περ ὁμολογέειν τῷ ταῦτα ἐργασαμένῳ, αὖτις δὲ τὸ

9 *μὴ δ'* ABP || *θέλωμεν* S || *τά τε*? coni. Stein$^{1\,2}$, adsc. van H. 10 *ἐμπεπρημένα* **a**C || *τε καὶ συγκεχωσμένα* om. Marc. 11 *μάλιστα* Marc. 12 *τοῖσι ταῦτα ἐργασαμένοισιν* **B**

χίαν ἀπολίποι τῶν Ἑλλήνων. That act might be held to regularize the 'lynching of Lykidas,' cp. 9. 5.

9. **πρῶτα μέν**: the first place is assigned to the *κώλυμα θεῶν* (cp. Thuc. 5. 30. 1), arising from the sacrilegious destruction of holy places and objects. The constant recurrence to this consideration assures us that this grievance bulked very largely in Athenian memories and may have deeply affected their feelings at the time, cp. c. 143 *supra*; it also supports a relatively early date for the speech: after the glories of Periklean Athens had more than restored the works destroyed by the Mede, the sharp edge of these feelings was abated. But the further inference that the Persian war was in any special sense a religious war, or that the Persians were inflamed by puritanical and iconoclastic zeal against the idolatry of Hellas, is an exaggeration; cp. c. 109 *supra*. **τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα**: cp. *τούς τε οἴκους καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα* c. 143. It is a question whether the Persian incendiaries or the Athenian restorers wrought the more havoc on the old Akropolis and its contents: the ancient wooden image of Athena, still to be seen in the days of Pausanias (1. 26. 6), had been transported to Salamis (Plutarch *Themist.* 10) and so preserved. Cp. Frazer ii. 340 f.; Hitzig-Bluemner, note *ad l.c.*

It is tolerably certain that the actual destruction by the Persians was exaggerated afterwards: in any case, at the ostensible date of this speech, their work of destruction was not yet fully accomplished; cp. 9. 13 *infra*. Blakesley remarks that after the battle of Plataia it became the popular view at Athens that the war had been waged against the Persians in revenge for the destruction of Hellenic temples: it is a far cry from the field of Plataia to the (fictitious) oath, which according to Lykurgos (*c. Leocr.* 82) was taken by the collective allies just before the battle of Plataia; cp. 7. 132 *supra*. But that the Athenian legend was well under way in the generation after the battle is proved by this very passage. (Cp. Plutarch *Perikl.* 17, and note to c. 109 *supra*.)

11. **τοῖσι ἡμέας ἀναγκαίως ἔχει τιμωρέειν ἐς τὰ μέγιστα.** This formula goes beyond the case of merely defensive warfare, and anticipates, or reproduces, the *πρόσχημα* of the Delian alliance (Th. 1. 96.). *τοῖσι* is masc. The Athenian view differs from the Delphian, cp. c. 36 *supra* (both no doubt *ex post facto*), as also from the 'vengeance is mine' of the Hebrew God (cp. *Romans* 12. 19 and reff.). But then Delphi had not been destroyed by the Persians.

12. **αὖτις δέ**: the second *κώλυμα* is 'political,' in the highest sense; it is the unity and solidarity of Hellenic culture, and what is perhaps implied rather than stated, its superiority to barbarism, the obligation to defend and to preserve it, the iniquity of betraying it: 'the cause of civilization itself is at stake.' The passage is, indeed, the *locus classicus* on 'the unity of Hellas,' and Curtius' great chapter under that title, *Gr. Gesch.* i.^{6} (1887) pp. 458–551, *Die griechische Einheit*, a brilliant commentary thereon.

τὸ Ἑλληνικόν: sc. *ἔθνος*, *γένος*, or simply a collective neuter = *οἱ Ἕλληνες*, in their potential union. Undoubtedly in the historic period, and for a good while before the fifth century, over the Greek peninsula, and around the Aegean coasts, to say nothing of Greater Greece and the outlying colonial regions, there was spread a dominant population, more or less homogeneous and national in character, and with a distinctive type of civilization of its own. Divided under various ethnic or tribal names (chiefly Aiolian, Dorian, Ionian, Achaian, cp. Hdt. 1. 56–58, 142–151); divided geographically into distinct territorial

Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὸν ὅμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματά

13 ἐὸν om. Pz

units (Thessalians, Boiotians, Athenians, Peloponnesians, Italiotes, Sikeliotes, etc. etc.); divided politically into separate and independent city-states innumerable; yet all claiming and recognizing each other as belonging to one communion, one organic system, one people—Greeks, as we say; Hellenes, as they preferred to name themselves.

Non-Hellenic elements were not unknown, or unrecognized, within the Hellenic area. There were sects, or strata, on the borders or even in the midst of Hellas, whose character was doubtful or even non-Hellenic, e.g. Aitolians, Epirotes, Makedonians, Pelasgoi, Leleges, Kaukones, etc. There were perhaps foreign intruders (Phoenician, etc.). There were more certainly survivals from a pre-Hellenic population. But these elements were in the main overcome, absorbed, assimilated, expelled, or reduced to insignificance, albeit their presence must be reckoned with, partly as enriching, partly as disturbing, the ideal homogeneity of the Hellenic type. The Hellenic name apparently originated in Thessaly (Homer, *Il.* 2. 683, 9. 395), and spread with the Achaians (or, less probably, the Dorians) over the whole aggregate (cp. J. B. Bury, 'History of the names Hellas, Hellenes,' *J.H.S.* xv. (1895) pp. 217 ff.). The Greek name, in itself every bit as ancient and authentic, originated in Italy as a collective name, having been brought thither by the Chalkidic colonies (cp. Busolt 1.² 198; Ed. Meyer, *G.d.A.* ii. (1893) 302), or more probably—as giving an earlier date—from Epeiros and that neighbourhood (Helbig in *Hermes* xi. (1876) 257); cp. Aristot. *Meteor.* 1. 353 A *αὕτη δ'* (sc. *ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἡ ἀρχαία*) *ἐστὶν ἡ περὶ Δωδώνην καὶ τὸν Ἀχελῷον· . . ᾤκουν γὰρ οἱ Σελλοὶ ἐνταῦθα καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι τότε μὲν Γραικοὶ νῦν δ' Ἕλληνες.*

13. **ὅμαιμον**, 'of one blood.' The expression here, this 'note' or 'test' of Hellenism, assumes the national pedigree, which traced the four main divisions of the Hellenic aggregate to the three sons of Hellen, Aiolos, Doros and Xuthos (through his sons Ion and Achaios). This pedigree cannot be much older than Hesiod, in whom it first meets us (*Frag.* 25 = Rzach 7: an entirely different ethnology rules in the Homeric poems), but its existence is implied in Herodotus (1. 56, 7. 94, 8. 44) and Thucydides (1. 3), and is fully given (from the logographs, etc.) in Strabo 383, 397, Apollodoros 1. 7. 3. In point of fact this note or test of Hellenism is but an explanation, in ethnological terms, of the historic fact of nationality, and is not itself a datum to start from, but a theorem to be proved. For it plainly means, not that in course of time by intermarriage there was brought about such a fusion in the aggregate that all Hellenes might be regarded as related to one another (in any case a highly disputable theorem): but it means that there really was a strict descent and genealogy in the Hellenic stock, *ab initio.* The pedigree in any case took little or no account of women: the theory belongs to a strictly 'patriarchal' stage or type of culture. A dominant race, a dominant strain, and that ultimately of 'Aryan' or 'Indo-European' origin, in the Hellenic aggregate, is proved by the remaining tests, and by the further one, the physical type, of which Hdt. takes here no specific account; but a veritable fusion and confusion of races and stocks probably underlies the Hellenic nationality.

ὁμόγλωσσον, 'of one tongue.' Language, including literature, is undoubtedly a strong mark of racial identity, especially in the earlier stages of a nation's evolution. The prevalence of the Greek language (and its purity) is perhaps the most remarkable fact, and coefficient, in the Hellenic communion. But language is in itself by no means a certain test of nationality, or of race, nor are those who speak one and the same language to be regarded as descendants of one and the same stock (the cases of Latin, of English, of Greek itself are evidential). But the predominance of a language in a given area proves certain conclusions, applicable to the case of the prevalence of Greek in the Hellenic area. (i.) The presence and prevalence (numerical, or political, or both) of the people whose language it is. Moreover, the relative purity of the Greek language points to the early and effective occupation of the given area by Hellenic tribes or folks.

τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἤθεά τε ὁμότροπα, τῶν προδότας γενέσθαι

14 τῶν **B** : ὧν καὶ z : ὧν

(ii.) Philology proves that the people whose native language was Greek belonged to the Indo-European (or Eurasian) stock, an observation which makes it certain that the Greeks themselves were immigrants into the region which became the theatre of Hellenic history. There is some evidence, however, of the persistence of non-Hellenic tongues within the Hellenic area, e.g. Hdt. 1. 57, and the non-Hellenic inscriptions (in Greek characters) found in Lemnos and in Krete. Perhaps also the varieties of Greek dialect may have been encouraged by the presence of pre-Hellenic elements in the population. The linguistic frontier is tolerably well defined round Greece proper: in the East, Karian is a foreign language, c. 135 *supra*, and the same is true of the Asianic languages generally. In the West the Epeirote and Illyrian are non-Hellenic (in the historic period), Thuc. 2. 68, 80, 81. In the North the position of Makedonian is rather doubtful, but though akin to Greek, it differs by more than merely dialectal variation, while Thrakian is distinctly 'barbarous.' In the South the Kretans of historic times speak Greek, but the non-Hellenic tongue survives in the east of the island (cp. 7. 171 *supra*).

θεῶν ἱδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι, 'common foundations, common sacrifices to gods'—that is, a common religion: common cults, a common theology. The great national centres of religion, with their cults, oracles, and festivals—Olympia, Delphi, Dodona (perhaps Delos), Eleusis—must be chiefly in the speaker's (or writer's) mind: the theology is not expressly mentioned, but may be assumed; cp. 2. 53. Perhaps nothing would more clearly show the genetic or non-primitive character of the Hellenic national communion than the history of Hellenic religion. The Hellenic and pan-Hellenic significance of Olympia and of Delphi (to take the most conspicuous examples) was comparatively recent. The pan-Hellenic *Agon* of Delphi has the year 585 B.C. as its epoch, and it was established by Kleisthenes of Sikyon and Solon of Athens (cp. J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*, 1890, Appendix D). The Olympian *Agon* was dated conventionally two centuries earlier (776 B.C.), but this is a 'prochronism'; the founder of the *Agon* was Pheidon of Argos, and the date of the foundation was probably 668 B.C. (Ol. 28; cp. Hdt. IV.–VI. i. 383, note to 6. 127). Delphi gave up to mankind what was intended for Hellenes; but the Hellenic character of the Olympian *Agon* is attested by two striking facts: (*a*) the title of the stewards, Ἑλλανοδίκαι, which must be associated with the establishment by Pheidon (the same title was used at Nemea). The adoption of this title presupposes the extensive recognition of 'Hellenes,' and 'Hellas.' (*b*) The inclusion of all Hellenes (2. 160) and the exclusion of 'barbarians' (5. 22) in the competition, which give it a truly 'national' character. But the common theology (*θεοὶ κοινοί* 9. 90 *infra*, *θεοὶ οἱ Ἑλλήνιοι* 5. 49) carries back further than the great festivals. There is apparent in Greece, even in the historic period, a wondrous variety of local cults and of local myths; but there is also apparent a large community of belief and worship: of this community the Homero-Hesiodic 'theology' (including the *Hymns*) may be taken as typical. This theology is, indeed, comparatively late (cp. Hdt. 2. 53), but its middle and latest ages imply a long past, a long process, a genesis; and the systematization, the general reception of the Homeric Pantheon, imply a large common stock of ideas and of practices, original or acquired, which in turn implies a long history, a long occupation of the area, over which this religious complex is recognizable.

14. **ἤθεά τε ὁμότροπα**, 'a uniform moral and political culture.' Under this head might be comprised: (i.) the city-state, with its republican constitutions of one kind or another; (ii.) the family and domestic institutions, marriage, paternal descent, etc.; (iii.) the usages in peace and war, *προξενία, κήρυκες*, etc.; (iv.) the ethical ideals in the fullest sense. But no one knew better than the Athenian Thucydides that this culture was itself a gradual growth, and not a primitive or intrinsic possession of the Hellenes: that primitive 'Hellas' was itself barbarous (*τὸ παλαιὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ὁμοιότροπα τῷ νῦν βαρβαρικῷ διαιτώμενον* 1. 6. 6).

'Αθηναίους οὐκ ἂν εὖ ἔχοι. ἐπίστασθέ τε οὕτω, εἰ μὴ πρότερον ἐτυγχάνετε ἐπιστάμενοι, ἔστ' ἂν καὶ εἷς περιῇ 'Αθηναίων, μηδαμὰ ὁμολογήσοντας ἡμέας Ξέρξῃ. ὑμέων μέντοι ἀγάμεθα τὴν προνοίην τὴν πρὸς ἡμέας ἐοῦσαν, ὅτι προείδετε ἡμέων οἰκοφθορημένων οὕτω ὥστε ἐπιθρέψαι ἐθέλειν ἡμέων τοὺς οἰκέτας. καὶ ὑμῖν μὲν ἡ χάρις ἐκπεπλήρωται, ἡμεῖς μέντοι

15 *μὴ καὶ* **B**, van H. 17 *μηδαμᾶ* Rz 18 *πρὸς*: *εἰς* R, Holder: *ἐς* SV, Gaisford, van H. || *ὑμέας* B[1] || *ἔχουσαν* **B**, Holder, van H. 19 *οἰκοφορημένων* R || *ἡμῖν* S marg. 20 *ἡμέες* **B**z

It is not the business of the speaker in this passage to qualify or to correct the extreme and enthusiastic assertion of 'the unity of Hellas'; but it is worth while for us to observe that under each of the four great tests, or factors, of Hellenism here propounded, history has significant exceptions and contrary instances to notice. Blood, Dialect, Religion, Ethos, were dividing lines in Hellas, though space here precludes further illustration.

16. **ἔστ' ἂν καὶ εἷς . . Ξέρξῃ**: this dotting of i's and crossing of t's (if it took place) was very unwise from a diplomatic point of view; to give such assurances to Alexander (c. 143 *supra*) was bad enough; to pledge themselves thus to Sparta was almost suicidal. It looks downright foolish in the light of the sequel: not alone the *γνώμη* of Lykidas (9. 5), who was one Athenian, but the formal declaration of Athenian representatives in Sparta, *ὅτι σύμμαχοι βασιλέος γινόμεθα* (9. 11). Hdt. appears quite unconscious of the satire he thus levels against Athens. The two narratives are from independent sources, and *more suo* he gives them both, without adjustment, for what they are worth.

17. **ὑμέων μέντοι.** Hitherto they have been speaking of themselves. The position of the words is emphatic. **ἀγάμεθα** appears to be used in a good sense, as in 4. 46, rather than in an ironical sense, as in 4. 157. Stein[5] detects, indeed, a politely satirical (*höflich hönisch*) tone in this speech, and finds in that tone, and in the large scale on which the whole story of the negotiations is narrated, evidence for two conclusions: (i.) that it was committed to writing at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war (i.e. 431 B.C.), and (ii.) that Hdt. takes sides with Athens against her ungrateful foes. As to the first point: (*a*) it assumes (as is too often assumed) that Sparta and Athens quarrelled for the first time in 431 B.C. As a matter of fact the direct feeling between Sparta and Athens was probably not so bitter in 431 B.C. as it had been in 446 B.C. or in 461 B.C.; (*b*) it ignores the bearing of the Makedonian question. The war in 431 B.C. was largely brought about by Perdikkas, who seems to have had a genuine and legitimate grievance against Perikles and Athens (cp. Thuc. 1. 57). It would be a strange way of taking sides with Athens at the outbreak of the war in 431 B.C. to make so much of the *εὔνοια, εὐεργεσίαι, προξενία, φιλία* of Alexander of Makedon. Possibly Hdt. sympathizes with Athens rather than with Sparta in this passage, but if so, it is an ideal sympathy, projected into the situation of 479 B.C., not an obscure and partisan commentary upon the outbreak of hostilities in 431 B.C. The Atticizing tone of the whole passage may be due to the Attic or phil-Athenian sources, from which Hdt. has drawn it. So far as Atticism illuminates the problem of composition, the passage is most easily intelligible as belonging to the earlier, perhaps to the earliest, draft of these Books. The slight suspicion of persiflage is, perhaps, misleading, for it ill accords with the heroics of the immediate context. The Spartan offer bore, indeed, rather too near a resemblance to inviting a colossal pledge, or hostage, from the Athenians; but an Athenian migration to Sparta had not been suggested; probably only Peloponnesos was intended, and for that move there was a precedent (cp. cc. 41 and 36 *supra*).

18. **προνοίην . . ὅτι προείδετε**, 'providence,' provision, provide; cp. *προνοίη* in a different sense, c. 87 *supra*. The verb in this sense is more generally in the middle (L. & S. *sub v.* *προεῖδον*).

19. **τοὺς οἰκέτας**: cp. c. 142 *supra*.

20. **ἡ χάρις ἐκπεπλήρωται**, 'your

λιπαρήσομεν οὕτω ὅκως ἂν ἔχωμεν, οὐδὲν λυπέοντες ὑμέας. νῦν δέ, ὡς οὕτω ἐχόντων, στρατιὴν ὡς τάχιστα ἐκπέμπετε. ὡς γὰρ ἡμεῖς εἰκάζομεν, οὐκ ἑκὰς χρόνου παρέσται ὁ βάρβαρος ἐσβαλέων ἐς τὴν ἡμετέρην, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὰν τάχιστα πύθηται τὴν ἀγγελίην ὅτι οὐδὲν ποιήσομεν τῶν ἐκεῖνος ἡμέων προσεδέετο. πρὶν ὦν παρεῖναι ἐκεῖνον ἐς τὴν Ἀττικήν, ἡμέας καιρός ἐστι προβοηθῆσαι ἐς τὴν Βοιωτίην." οἳ μὲν ταῦτα ὑποκριναμένων Ἀθηναίων ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς Σπάρτην.

21 *λιπαρήσωμεν* Marc. 23 *ἡμέες* **ß** || *οἰκάζομεν* Marc. || *ἑᾶις χρόνον* C 24 *ἐσβαλέων* Naber, Stein[3]: *ἐσβαλὼν* || *ἐπειδὰν*: *ἐπεὰν* Abicht, Holder || *ἐπειδὰν πύθηται τάχιστα* malit van H. 25 *προσεδέκετο* C 26 *ὑμέας* Wesseling, van H. 27 *προβωθῆσαι* R, van H.: *προσβωθῆσαι* SV, Gaisford || *οἳ . . Σπάρτην* in principio libri noni Pz: utrobique ceteri ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ Η | ΧΧΗΗΗΔΔΙΙ **α**: *ἡροδότου ἱστοριῶν η'* CR: *τέλος ἡροδότου ἱστοριῶν ὀγδόης* Marc.

kindness leaves nothing to be desired'—is full to overflowing—is far more than we had any right to expect. *χάρις* is here better taken as the 'gracious act' (an offer) on the part of Sparta than as 'the feeling of gratitude' on the part of Athens. The perf. pass. is not so much temporal as qualitative in significance.

ἡμεῖς μέντοι: contr. *ὑμέων μέντοι* just above.

21. **λιπαρήσομεν**, 'we shall continue to hold out'; cp. 9. 45 (*μένοντες*), 5. 19 (*τῇ πόσει*).

οὕτω ὅκως ἂν ἔχωμεν, 'as best we may'; cp. c. 143 *supra*. **λυπέοντες**, 'causing annoyance to.'

22. **στρατιὴν ὡς τάχιστα ἐκπέμπετε**: the conference at Athens is quite at the end of the winter. Mardonios is, however, represented as still in Thessaly 9. 1. If the story just told, the speeches reported, be true, or anywhere near the truth, the Athenians had themselves to thank for the Spartan delay in responding to this demand; they have given away their diplomatic weapons in a fit of pan-Hellenic generosity.

23. **οὐκ ἑκὰς χρόνου**, 'before long.' *ἑκάς* is generally a *local* adverb; it is, however, used absolutely of time, Pindar *Pyth.* 2. 98 (54), Aischyl. *Agam.* 1650. For the use of the adv. with the generic genitive Stein compares Aischyl. *Suppl.* 597 *εἰσόπιν χρόνου.*

25. **προσεδέετο**: like the simple verb, constructed with the double genitive, *pers. et rei*, *τῶν . . ἡμέων*, cp. cc. 3. 8, 26. 2 *supra*. (Stronger than taking *τῶν* as genitive by attraction = *τούτων ἅ*, 6. 35 notwithstanding; cp. 5. 40 *σεν τῆς ἐξέσιος*, 3. 157 *ἐπιτράπεσθαι ἕτοιμοι ἦσαν τῶν ἐδέετο σφέων.*)

26. **ἡμέας**, 'you and us,' us both. So Schweighaeuser.

27. **ἐς τὴν Βοιωτίην**: this rendezvous could not be thus treated as a matter of course, except as the result of preliminary deliberations and a definite plan of campaign, perhaps the original one; cp. c. 40 *supra*.

οἳ μέν κτλ. The corresponding sentence opens the ninth Book: there is no grammatical break. Cp. the transition between Bks. 7 and 8.

ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ

ΚΑΛΛΙΟΠΗ

Μαρδόνιος δέ, ὥς οἱ ἀπονοστήσας Ἀλέξανδρος τὰ παρὰ 1 Ἀθηναίων ἐσήμηνε, ὁρμηθεὶς ἐκ Θεσσαλίης ἦγε τὴν στρατιὴν σπουδῇ ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας. ὅκου δὲ ἑκάστοτε γίνοιτο, τούτους παρελάμβανε. τοῖσι δὲ Θεσσαλίης ἡγεομένοισι οὔτε τὰ πρὸ τοῦ πεπρηγμένα μετέμελε οὐδὲν πολλῷ τε μᾶλλον ἐπῆγον τὸν Πέρσην, καὶ συμπροέπεμψέ τε Θώρηξ ὁ Ληρισαῖος Ξέρξην

ΚΑΛΛΙΟΠΗ Θ A: ΚΑΛΛΙΟΠΗ B: *καλλιόπη θ′* C: *καλλιόπη* R: *καλλιόπη ἡροδότου ἱστοριῶν ἐννάτη* Marc. 1. 1 *παρ'* **B** 5 *μετέμελλεν* **B** 6 *τε*: *τῷ* R: om. CP || *ληρισσαῖος* **B**Pz || *ξέρξεα* **B**z

---

1. 1. **Μαρδόνιος δέ**, corresponding with *οἱ μέν* in the preceding sentence, the last of Bk. 8. There is not merely no material break between Bks. 8 and 9, but not even a formal or grammatical division. **ἀπονοστέειν**, 8. 38 etc.

τὰ παρ' Ἀθηναίων, 'the Athenian answer,' an ellipse of *ἔπη* or *λεχθέντα*: cp. Thuc. 8. 48. 3 *τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου*.

2. **ὁρμηθείς**, of a physical act; cp. *ὅρμα* 8. 106. **ἐκ Θεσσαλίης**: that Mardonios wintered in Thessaly seems a fairly well-established fact (cp. 8. 113 f., 131), but does not involve the supposition that he abandoned all hold on Central Greece: were not the Makedonian garrisons, perhaps, in occupation of Boiotia throughout the winter? Cp. 8. 34.

3. **ὅκου . . παρελάμβανε**: for the constr. cp. 8. 115. The statement prepares us for the estimate in c. 32 *infra* of 50,000 Greeks under arms in the forces of Mardonios. Diodor. 11. 28 raises the figure to 500,000 by levies on Thrakians, Makedonians and Greeks! Cp. Appendix VIII. § 2 (iv.).

4. **τοῖσι . . Θεσσαλίης ἡγεομένοισι**: the Aleuadai, cp. 7. 6, 130, their chief man being Thorax of Larisa, named just below. The victory of Salamis had apparently done little to convince the Thessalian cavaliers that the Greek was the winning side. Stein observes that Hdt. sees in the *Aleuadai* the most active promoters of the war, and is glad to emphasize their guilt (cp. 7. 130, 172). **παρῆκε** here in particular involves a gross exaggeration: the roads and passes were not in the hands of Thorax; Thermopylai, for example, was doubtless held by a Persian force; and so on. Demaratos and the Athenian exiles cut no figures in the camp of Mardonios: have they retired in the king's suite?

6. **Θώρηξ** is named again in c. 58 *infra* with his brethren; before the end of the sixth century he had given a commission to Pindar, evidence of which we have in the poet's earliest extant work (*Pyth.* 10, *anno* 502 B.C.), in which also Thorax

φεύγοντα καὶ τότε ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ παρῆκε Μαρδόνιον ἐπὶ
2 *τὴν Ἑλλάδα. ἐπεὶ δὲ πορευόμενος γίνεται ὁ στρατὸς ἐν Βοιωτοῖσι, οἱ Θηβαῖοι κατελάμβανον τὸν Μαρδόνιον καὶ συνεβούλευον αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὡς οὐκ εἴη χῶρος ἐπιτηδεότερος ἐνστρατοπεδεύεσθαι ἐκείνου, οὐδὲ ἔων ἰέναι ἑκαστέρω, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ ἰζόμενον ποιέειν ὅκως ἀμαχητὶ τὴν πᾶσαν Ἑλλάδα καταστρέψεται. κατὰ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν Ἕλληνας ὁμο-*

7 *παρεῖκε* z 2. 1 *ἐπείτε*? van H. 2 *τὸν* om. **B** || *καὶ συνεβούλευον αὐτῷ* del. Cobet, van H. 3 *ἐπιτηδεώτερος* CPz, van H. 4 *ἐνστρατεύεσθαι* C || *ἑκαστέρωι* **a** : *ἑκατέρω* **B** 6 *καταστρέψεται* Steger : *καταστρέψηται* codd. : *καταστρέψητε* z

is named (l. 64). Thorax may have been *Tagos* of Thessaly: whether the Skopadai (cp. 6. 127) were acquiescent or co-operating is not quite clear; cp. 7. 172.

7. **φεύγοντα**: Xerxes' *νόστος* is a *φυγή*; cp. 8. 97, 103, 115, 120.

2. 2. **οἱ Θηβαῖοι κατελάμβανον τὸν Μ.**, 'the Thebans tried to stay Mardonios . .'

3. **οὐκ εἴη χῶρος κτλ.**: these representations were not ultimately lost upon Mardonios, who had at least no intention of risking a pitched battle in Attica. The physiographical merits of Boiotia, from a military point of view, made it again and again the scene of important battles both in Greek and in Roman times (Plataia, Tanagra, Delion, Haliartos, Koroneia, Leuktra, Orchomenos, Chaironeia); but it was apparently not so much on its advantages as fighting ground that the Thebans laid stress, as on the advantages it offered (1) for supplies, (2) as a headquarters and base of negotiations. He was to halt there (**αὐτοῦ**) and work for obtaining possession of Greece **ἀμαχητί**. *ἀμαχητί* by itself would not necessarily imply that the Thebans apprehended a Persian defeat in the event of battle: the Persian conqueror stood to lose by the losses he might inflict, as well as by those he incurred; but the next sentence suggests the graver alternative. **συνεβούλευον** must be repeated after **ἀλλά** (*brachylogy*).

4. **οὐδὲ ἔων ἰέναι ἑκαστέρω**, 'and were for hindering his further advance.' The two reasons given for their advice are scarcely cognate, the one suggesting an appeal to arms, the other a recourse to intrigue; but cp. next note.

6. **κατὰ μὲν γὰρ . . ἅπασι ἀνθρώποισι**: a remarkable sentence both in a material and in a formal sense. Materially it recognizes the power of a united Hellas especially for resistance; cp. Hdt.'s own judgement upon 'a united Thrace,' 5. 3, or Aristotle's upon the Greek race, *Pol.* 4 (7). 7. 3 = 1327 B *δυνάμενον ἄρχειν πάντων μιᾶς τυγχάνον πολιτείας*. Formally there are some disputable points in the sentence: (*a*) **κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρόν** is taken by Baehr (followed by Stein) *vi armisque*; cp. 1. 76 *ἐπειρῶντο κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν ἀλλήλων* ('they made trial of each other in respect of strength'; or 'they made trial of each other with might and main'?) The words might be taken (as by Gail) with **ὁμοφρονέοντας** ('united heart and soul'): Blakesley, again, renders, 'in point of actual force,' taking them as qualifying the whole sentence. (*b*) **οἵ περ καὶ πάρος ταὐτὰ ἐγίνωσκον** may refer to the actual members of the Hellenic *Symmachy*, 'those, to wit, who were previously of one mind,' or, more generally, those who should agree previously (before being attacked). **πάρος** does not occur elsewhere in Hdt. (*c*) For the reading **χαλεπούς** see App. Crit. (*d*) **περιγίνεσθαι**, not so much 'to survive' as 'to get the upper hand'; the construction is curious, as the verb seems to govern the accusative. (*e*) **Ἕλληνας ὁμοφρονέοντας**, as though *περιγ.* = *νικᾶν*. But the acc. may better perhaps be taken as an *acc. pendens* (with Baehr). Blakesley explains the *anacoluthon* as due to the difficulty of expressing the sentiment politely (a difficulty not arising from Boiotian stupidity, but from the nature of the case!). (*f*) **καὶ ἅπασι ἀνθρώποισι** is collective, 'even all the world together,' not distributive, 'any men in existence.' A united

φρονέοντας, οἵ περ καὶ πάρος ταῦτα ἐγίνωσκον, χαλεποὺς εἶναι περιγίνεσθαι καὶ ἅπασι ἀνθρώποισι· "εἰ δὲ ποιήσεις τὰ ἡμεῖς παραινέομεν," ἔφασαν λέγοντες, "ἕξεις ἀπόνως ἅπαντα τὰ ἐκείνων ἰσχυρὰ βουλεύματα· πέμπε χρήματα ἐς τοὺς δυναστεύοντας ἄνδρας ἐν τῇσι πόλισι, πέμπων δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα διαστήσεις· ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ τοὺς μὴ τὰ σὰ φρονέοντας ῥηιδίως μετὰ τῶν στασιωτέων καταστρέψεαι." οἳ μὲν ταῦτα συν- **3**
εβούλευον, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἐπείθετο, ἀλλά οἱ δεινὸς ἐνέστακτο ἵμερος

---

7 *ταῦτα* RV || *χαλεποὺς* coni. Stein², van H.: *χαλεπὰ* ('quod ferri nequit, nisi forte ante *περιγίνεσθαι* exciderunt verba *νικᾶν τε καὶ*' van H.: haec eadem in textum recep. Holder) 8 *περιγενέσθαι* **β** || *ποιήσειας* z 9 *ἕξεις*: 'an *σχίσεις*?' Kallenberg || *πάντα* **α**CP, Stein² 10 *κείνων* z || *ἰσχυρὰ* om. **α**C, van H. 13 *μετὰ στρατιωτέων* **β** || *κατάστρεψαι* **β**C **3.** 2 *ἐπίθετο* R || *δεινός τις* **β**, Holder, van H.

Hellas, which knew its own mind (even if only comprising the actually existing confederacy), could hold its own against a world in arms.

9. **ἕξεις**, 'thou shalt be in possession of . .' If **ἰσχυρά** were to stand, it would favour taking *κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρόν* just above with *ὁμοφρονέοντας*. But cp. App. Crit.

10. **πέμπε χρήματα ἐς τοὺς δυναστεύοντας . .**, 'divide Hellas by bribery —of the men in power in the cities.' *Prima facie* this might be taken to imply that the masses, the *δῆμος*, were more anti-Persian than the 'dynasts,' the *δυνατοί*. Something of that sort is urged by the Theban orator in Thucydides, 3. 62. 3, and the term **δυναστεύοντας** here is illuminated by the words there used to describe the condition of Thebes in 480 B.C.: *δυναστεία ὀλίγων ἀνδρῶν εἶχε τὰ πράγματα*. But perhaps Athens is not included in the Theban programme, and Sparta with the Peloponnesian cities may be mainly in view (cp. Diodor. *l.c. infra*). The proposal is not so much to overthrow democracies by medizing oligarchs, as to divide the Hellenic confederacy, separating the partisans of Persia (**τῶν στασιωτέων**, 'your partisans') from **τοὺς μὴ τὰ σὰ φρονέοντας**. The two points are not perhaps clearly distinguished in this passage; and even among the Athenians (it must be admitted), just before Plataia, there was a strong medizing faction, if the story told by Plutarch, *Arist.* 13, is true. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 2 (iii.).

11. **τὴν Ἑλλάδα διαστήσεις**, 'thou shalt divide Hellas against itself'; cp. *διαστάντας* 4. 11, 'dividing into two bodies'—*κατὰ πόλεις δὲ διέσταμεν* Thuc. 4. 61. 1. The advice is repeated by Artabazos c. 41 *infra*.

3. 2. **ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἐπείθετο**: yet just below, c. 5, Hdt. himself suggests that Lykidas, the Athenian, had perhaps received money from Mardonios. Diodor. 11. 28. 3 asserts that Mardonios *τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ πόλεων ἐπειρᾶτό τινας ἀφιστάνειν, χρήματα διαπεμπόμενος τοῖς προεστηκόσι*. He was, of course, *en rapport* with Argos; cp. c. 12 *infra*. The mission of Arthmios of Zela (Plutarch, *Themist.* 6) cannot be referred with confidence to this precise point (as by Duncker vii.⁵ 318), but it is hardly likely that Mardonios omitted to employ so obvious a weapon as bribery. Rawlinson points out (iv.³ 374) that Mardonios was very late in reoccupying Athens, and thinks that he spent the spring in efforts to win over some of the Greek states by bribery. The Atticizing source speaks in the next words of Hdt. and accounts for the supposed folly of Mardonios.

ἀλλά: i.e. *δεινὸς γάρ οἱ κτλ.* **ἐνέστακτο**: the simple verb occurs 6. 74, and in the literal sense; and with the preposition uncompounded, Pindar, *Pyth.* 9. 110 *νέκταρ ἐν χείλεσσι καὶ ἀμβροσίαν στάξοισι*. Here, of course, as there, it is a brilliant metaphor (as of poison ?), the pluperfect pointing rather to the depth than to the date of his passion. This passage is, however, more probably a reminiscence of *Od.* 2. 271 *εἰ δή τοι σοῦ*

τὰς Ἀθήνας δεύτερα ἑλεῖν, ἅμα μὲν ὑπ' ἀγνωμοσύνης, ἅμα δὲ πυρσοῖσι διὰ νήσων ἐδόκεε βασιλέι δηλώσειν ἐόντι ἐν Σάρδισι ὅτι ἔχοι Ἀθήνας· ὃς οὐδὲ τότε ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν εὗρε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ἀλλ' ἔν τε Σαλαμῖνι τοὺς πλείστους ἐπυνθάνετο εἶναι ἔν τε τῇσι νηυσί, αἱρέει τε ἔρημον τὸ ἄστυ. ἡ δὲ βασιλέος αἵρεσις ἐς τὴν ὑστέρην τὴν Μαρδονίου ἐπιστρατηίην δεκάμηνος ἐγένετο.

4 Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι ἐγένετο ὁ Μαρδόνιος, πέμπει ἐς Σαλαμῖνα Μουρυχίδην ἄνδρα Ἑλλησπόντιον φέροντα τοὺς

3 ἐλέειν V, Schaefer, Gaisford 4 βασιλεῖ AB || δηλώσει R: δηλω cum σ superscr. V 5 τὰς Ἀθήνας **B** || ὃς: ὁ δὲ Stein(2) 7 τε post ἐν om. **B** || ἐρῆμον CPz 8 βασιλῆος z || ὑστεραίην CPz || τὴν: τοῦ Marc. 4. 1 ἐπείτε? van H. || ἐν om. **B** || ὁ om. z 2 βουργίδην C: μουριχίδην Rz

πατρὸς ἐνέστακται μένος ἠύ (a passage which might have suggested to Pindar the use of the simple verb in *Nem.* 10. 82).

3. **δεύτερα,** 'a second time'; not *τὸ δεύτερον*—for Mardonios had not 'captured' it the first time; cp. c. 4 *infra.*

ἅμα μὲν . . ἅμα δέ: the two *cola* are not strictly correlative. **ἀγνωμοσύνη,** vanity, arrogancy, obstinacy—cause for effect; cp. c. 41 *infra*: the same word is used of the Athenians c. 4 *infra.*

4. **πυρσοῖσι διὰ νήσων:** cp. 7. 183 on this method of signalling, and the opening of the immortal *Agamemnon,* which Stein suggests was a grand anachronism, based upon this historic Mardoniograph. But Mardonios did not at this time control the 'islands'; his only line of communication was by the mainland. The king is in Sardes; cp. c. 108 *infra.* Perhaps then Hdt. has borrowed from Aischylos (the *Oresteia* was presented in 458 B.C.).

6. **ἔν τε Σαλαμῖνι:** was there in truth a second complete evacuation of Attica and Athens? i.e. had the Athenians in fact reoccupied their city and houses? Had they already begun the rebuilding to which Themistokles exhorted them 8. 109 *supra*? They may have attempted to raise a harvest, perhaps, in Attica, or in the parts nearest Salamis; but there is fair room for doubt whether they undertook the rebuilding of the city until they were assured that they should not see the Persian army any more in the land. Hdt. is, indeed, explicit on the point c. 6 *infra*; but he might have been mistaken. A large number of the Athenians may have wintered in Salamis. Their occupation, or reoccupation, of the island implies a confidence in their superiority by sea.

7. **ἔν τε τῇσι νηυσί:** the only Attic ships for which Hdt. accounts at this time are those with the Hellenic fleet at Aigina, which numbers but 110 in all; 8. 131 *supra.* Where were the rest? Had they been left on the Attic side Mardonios would certainly have used or have destroyed them. A goodly Attic fleet must have been in and around Salamis itself, and have counted for something in the whole plan of campaign, though completely ignored by Hdt.

9. **δεκάμηνος:** ten—or rather nine—months earlier. This date is doubtless correct, and reckoned by the Attic Calendar, but unfortunately it is only approximate. Rawlinson places the reoccupation of Athens in June, and remarks even so upon the waste of time (above accounted for): this chronology would allow both occupations to the same Archontic year. Stein brings Mardonios to Athens "after the middle of July" (Xerxes having reached Athens "after the middle of September"), that is, places the two events in different Archontic years. Busolt ii.[2] 722 f. dates the event to the second half of June (in Skirophorion). Hdt.'s term, if anything, favours the view that the two events belong to the same official year; otherwise, too, he would perhaps have added the Archon; cp. 8. 51.

4. 2. **Μουρυχίδην ἄνδρα Ἑλλησπόντιον.** The proper name appears in Attic as *Μορυχίδης* and *Μυριχίδης*; cp.

αὐτοὺς λόγους τοὺς καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδὼν τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι διεπόρθμευσε. ταῦτα δὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἀπέστελλε προέχων μὲν τῶν Ἀθηναίων οὐ φιλίας γνώμας, ἐλπίζων δὲ σφέας ὑπήσειν τῆς ἀγνωμοσύνης ὡς δοριαλώτου ἐούσης τῆς Ἀττικῆς χώρης καὶ ἐούσης ὑπ᾽ ἑωυτῷ. τούτων μὲν εἵνεκα **5** *ἀπέπεμψε Μουρυχίδην ἐς Σαλαμῖνα, ὁ δὲ ἀπικόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν*

3 οὓς **a**C 5 *προέχων* : *προσδοκῶν* Krueger : (*προσδοκέων* ? van H.) || *ἐλπίσας* **B** || *δὲ σφέας* R, Stein[2] : *δέ σφεας* 6 *δορυαλώτου* z || *πάσης τῆς* RSV, Gaisford, Holder 7 *καὶ ἐούσης ἤδη* RSV, Gaisford, Holder : *καὶ . . ἑωυτῷ* secl. van H. **5.** 1 *τουτέων* z || *ἕνεκα* **a**C : *εἵνεκεν* **B** 2 *Μουριχίδην* z

Μορυχίων and *Μόρυχος*, a tragic poet, the butt of sundry Aristophanic gibes (*Acharn.* 887, *Wasps* 506, 1142, *Peace* 1008). *Μόρυχος* was also an epithet of Dionysos, 'in Sicily,' his face 'soiled' with wine-lees (cp. *μορύσσειν*), and there was a proverb *μωρότερος Μορύχου* or *Μωρύχου* (Photius, *Lex.*, *et al.*). This Hellespontine with his proposals was surely 'a son of the foul fiend' to Athens! There is a want of precision about his habitat; *Ἑλλησπόντιοι* have, indeed, been mentioned collectively as furnishing 100 ships to the Persian fleet (7. 95), and an anonymous 'Hellespontian' is credited with a crude remark, 7. 56; was this Morychides the man? How does a 'Hellespontine' come to be with Mardonios? Was he the nearest thing to an 'Ionian,' or an Athenian, that the Persian could employ? Was he perhaps an ex-Athenian Kleruch?

φέροντα τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους κτλ. : cp. 8. 140. Some of the *λόγοι* would suit the present situation better than the former; e.g. the order from the king *τὴν γῆν σφι ἀπόδος κτλ.*, which have a direct bearing on Mardonios' fiery message *ὅτι ἔχοι Ἀθήνας* c. 3 *supra*. *φέροντα* is but slightly metaphorical; indeed, if the *λόγοι* were in writing (a despatch), not even slightly. **διεπόρθμευσε** is very highly metaphorical, though less highly if the Athenians had already been in Salamis when 'Alexander the Makedonian' visited them. The word is elsewhere by Hdt. always used of actually crossing water; cp. 8. 130 *supra*, 1. 205, 4. 141, 5. 52.

4. **τὸ δεύτερον** : cp. c. 3 *supra*.

5. **προέχων μὲν τῶν Ἀθηναίων οὐ φιλίας γνώμας**, 'though already in possession of the hostile mind (or resolutions) of the Athenians' (against himself). This simple use of *προ-* in comp. (=*πρότερον*, so Wesseling) is observable; cp. *προοφειλομένη* in 5. 82. Blakesley somewhat perversely takes *προέχων* as 'putting forward.' *φίλιος* (*λόγος*) 7. 163, and in the comparative 7. 151.

6. **ὑπήσειν τῆς ἀγνωμοσύνης** : the verb used intrans. as in 1. 156 *ὑπεὶς τῆς ὀργῆς* (cp. also 7. 162 *supra* abs.); in the middle *vid.* 2. 121, 4. 181. The substantive as in c. 3 *supra*; here used from Mardonios' point of view (*ἐλπίζων*, not, by the way, 'hoping,' but 'expecting'). **δοριαλώτου**, as in 8. 74 *supra*.

7. **ἐούσης ὑπ᾽ ἑωυτῷ** : the preposition with the dat. is no doubt very strong, but the participle, especially in repetition, is rather thin; it would be strengthened by omission the first time. Cp. App. Crit.

5. 2. **ἀπικόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν βουλήν.** The Athenian *βουλή*, the Athenian *ἐκκλησία*, are working in Salamis; this is a 'record' in its way—for Salamis was not strictly a part of Attica (cp. 8. 11. 13 *supra*); it marks again a stage in the education of the Athenians, who grasp the principle that where the Athenians are there is Athens. It is especially remarkable that the *probouleutic* office is discharged by the *Boule* of 500 (not by the Strategoi, for example, as at Samos in 412 B.C.) notwithstanding the state of war. It is just, however, conceivable that the *Boule* here in action was not the 500 but the Areiopagos which performed some vague services in the Persian war; cp. Aristotle, *Pol.* 8. 4. 8=1304 A, *Ἀθ. π.* 23, Plutarch, *Them.* 10. *ἐπελθών* (cp. c. 7 *infra*) or *παρελθών* (cp. 8. 81) might have been expected here in place of the less technical **ἀπικόμενος**.

βουλὴν ἔλεγε τὰ παρὰ Μαρδονίου. τῶν δὲ βουλευτέων Λυκίδης εἶπε γνώμην ὡς ἐδόκεε ἄμεινον εἶναι δεξαμένους τὸν λόγον, τόν σφι Μουρυχίδης προσφέρει, ἐξενεῖκαι ἐς τὸν δῆμον. ὃ μὲν δὴ ταύτην τὴν γνώμην ἀπεφαίνετο, εἴτε δὴ δεδεγμένος χρήματα παρὰ Μαρδονίου, εἴτε καὶ ταῦτά οἱ ἑάνδανε· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ αὐτίκα δεινὸν ποιησάμενοι οἵ τε ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ οἱ ἔξωθεν ὡς ἐπύθοντο, περιστάντες Λυκίδην κατέλευσαν βάλλοντες,

---

5 Μουριχίδης *z* || προσφέρει Krueger, Cobet, van H., Stein[3] : προφέρει || ἐξενεῖκεν **B** 7 οἱ ante καὶ *z* 9 λυκίδεα **B***z* || βάλλοντες del. van H.

---

4. **Λυκίδης εἶπε γνώμην,** 'Lykidas moved a resolution . .' The phrase is technically correct, *γνώμην* being generally dropped in the documents. Hdt. does not know, or at least does not give, the man's patronymic or *Demotikon.* The name Lykidas was, or became, very rare in Athens; it occurs twice in Demosthenes, (1) of a slave belonging to Chabrias, (2) of a miller (cp. *Orat. Att.*, Baiter and Sauppe, *Index* ii. 91). The odd thing is that Demosthenes, *de Coron.* 204, tells this story, but with two important variations: (1) the traitor's name is Kyrsilos, (2) the date is before Salamis; cp. Cicero *de Off.* 3. 11. 2. Thirlwall (ii. 363 n.) attempts to harmonize by supposing Kyrsilos a nickname of Lykidas; but Kyrsilos is a good proper name; cp. Strabo, 530 (a Pharsalian), and *C.I.G.* ii. 2347 (a Naxian). Moreover, the discrepancy of date remains. Rawlinson reconciles the two stories by accepting them both as true! Grote (iv. 249 n.), while recognizing the Herodotean as the more probable of the two stories, shows the improbability of both being true; it would indeed be easier to believe that they are both fictitious—an hypothesis more creditable to the constitutional morality of the Athenians and the common humanity of their wives. The proposal ascribed to Lykidas would be 'accursed' (anathema) under the act of Aristeides above cited; cp. notes to 8. 144.

ἐδόκεε ἄμεινον εἶναι, 'it seemed good . .' (not *ἔδοξε,* 'it was decided.' But Hdt.'s imperfects are not always to be rigidly pressed).

δεξαμένους: cp. 8. 115 *supra.*

5. **προσφέρει,** not like the Pythia, cp. 4. 151, 5. 63 (a divine revelation or behest), still less like the Persian writers, 1. 3 (a reproach), but more simply, 'brings forward . .' But cp. App. Crit.

ἐξενεῖκαι ἐς τὸν δῆμον: i.e. 'lay before the Ekklesia,' exactly as in 5. 79.

6. **εἴτε δὴ δεδεγμένος χρήματα,** the more plausible alternative, **εἴτε καί** the less. *δεδεγμένος,* perhaps merely to avoid repeating *δεξάμενος* (from just above), albeit *δεδεγμένους* could not be used above without a change of sense. (The passive form of p.p. with middle sense is noticeable.) Does Hdt. overlook the inconsistency of this alternative with his own statement, cc. 2, 3 *supra*? or has Mardonios now, being in possession of Athens, thought better of the Thebans' advice?

7. **ἑάνδανε:** cp. c. 19 *infra.*

8. **οἵ τε ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ οἱ ἔξωθεν:** these two classes, or groups, are comprised in **Ἀθηναῖοι** just before. By **οἱ ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς** Hdt. might have meant simply *οἱ βουλευταί,* 'the members of the Council.' Baehr's *senatores qui e senatu egressi* etc. goes beyond the necessary meaning of the words (though perhaps not beyond the actual facts of the case). Nor need **οἱ ἔξωθεν** mean 'those outside the Council-chamber,' but only those outside the Bar (*δρύφακτοι*), exactly described by Demosthenes: *l.c.* *τοὺς περιεστηκότας ἔξωθεν καὶ ἀκροωμένους,* i.e. persons within hearing of the proceedings in the Council (Baehr unfortunately equates *ἀκροωμένους* there with *ὡς ἐπύθοντο* here!). Hdt. himself, indeed, by adding *ὡς ἐπύθοντο* (which of course refers only to *οἱ ἔξωθεν*) shows that he does not understand *the Attic source,* which intended **οἱ ἔξωθεν περιστάντες** to be taken together.

9. **Λυκίδην κατέλευσαν βάλλοντες:** to Hdt. this execution is apparently a wild act of irregular justice, an instance of 'Lynch-law.' On the face of it this

τὸν δὲ Ἑλλησπόντιον Μουρυχίδην ἀπέπεμψαν ἀσινέα. γενομένου δὲ θορύβου ἐν τῇ Σαλαμῖνι περὶ τὸν Λυκίδην, πυνθάνονται τὸ γινόμενον αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Ἀθηναίων, διακελευσαμένη δὲ γυνὴ γυναικὶ καὶ παραλαβοῦσα ἐπὶ τὴν Λυκίδεω οἰκίην ἤισαν αὐτοκελέες, καὶ κατὰ μὲν ἔλευσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα κατὰ δὲ τὰ τέκνα.

Ἐς δὲ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα διέβησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὧδε. ἕως **6** *μὲν προσεδέκοντο ἐκ τῆς Πελοποννήσου στρατὸν ἥξειν τιμωρήσοντά σφι, οἳ δὲ ἔμενον ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ· ἐπεὶ δὲ οἳ μὲν μακρότερα καὶ σχολαίτερα ἐποίεον, ὃ δὲ ἐπιὼν καὶ δὴ ἐν τῇ*

10 *μουριχίδεα* RV : *μουρυχίδεα* S : *Μουριχίδην z* : del. van H. 11 *ἐν . . Λυκίδην* del. van H. || *λυκίδεα* **β**P*z* 12 *τῶν Ἀθηναίων αἱ γυναῖκες τὸ γινόμενον z* 13 *ἤισαν* **α** : *ἤεσαν* **β**P*z* : *ἦσαν* C 6. 1 *οἱ* om. P*z* || *ὧιδε* CP 2 *τὸν ἐκ z* 3 *σφι* : *σφίσι*? van H. 4 *τε καὶ z* || *σχολαιότερα* S || *ἐς τὴν βοιωτίην* **β**P*z*

view is unsatisfactory. Was the execution of Lykidas an instance of that summary jurisdiction which the *Boule* formerly possessed (cp. Ἀθ. π. 41. 2, 45), or was the *Boule* here in question the Areiopagos? Was Lykidas stoned as 'Anathema' under the psephism of Aristeides (cp. 8. 144, and c. 2 *supra*), or, again, was there a formal psephism condemning the traitor? Lykurg. *contr. Leocrat.* 122 *ἄξιον τοίνυν ἀκοῦσαι καὶ τοῦ περὶ τοῦ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι τελευτήσαντος γενομένου ψηφίσματος, ὃν ἡ βουλή, ὅτι λόγῳ μόνῳ ἐνεχείρει προδιδόναι τὴν πόλιν, περιελομένη τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτοχειρὶ ἀπέκτεινεν.* Or was this psephism passed *ex post facto*, to whitewash and justify the illegal execution? (Of all the orators Lykurgos is the worst as a historical authority: he even by anticipation makes the mistake, not uncommon nowadays, of confounding Pausanias 'the King' with Pausanias 'the Regent'; cp. c. 128 *infra*.)

κατέλευσαν, c. 120 *infra*.

10. **τὸν δὲ . . ἀσινέα**: a remarkable illustration of their respect for law, the law of nations; cp. 7. 133 *supra*.

12. **αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Ἀθηναίων**: the only record of any active service by the Attic women in the war, who appear in general passive as sheep, shipped and shifted about from one place to another. It recalls the action reported on another occasion, 5. 87, of which Hdt. records: *Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ ἔτι τοῦ πάθεος δεινότερόν τι δόξαι εἶναι τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἔργον.*

διακελευσαμένη: cp. 7. 16 *supra*.

13. **παραλαβοῦσα**: sc. *γυνὴ γυναῖκα*, cp. *παρελάμβανε* c. 1. *supra*. The whole construction is a kind of *σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος*.

τὴν Λυκίδεω οἰκίην: the scene is laid in Salamis: had Lykidas the Councillor a house there? Or was his house in Athens, or in Attica, and is this a slip? Should the scene have been laid in Athens, and earlier? Or, in fact, is Demosthenes right that the scene was before the battle of Salamis? It would be easier to account for the 'Hellespontine' in that case. But the whole story is unsatisfactory. Within a few days of this heroic scene—with its 'No surrender' and 'As long as the Sun keeps his path in Heaven, or one single Athenian citizen survive'—the Athenians sent to Sparta threatening to make terms with the king, cc. 6, 11 *infra*.

14. **αὐτοκελέες** is an *Hapaxlegomenon* = *αὐτοκέλευστοι* (L. & S.).

κατὰ μὲν . . κατὰ δέ, a violent tmesis; cp. 8. 33.

6. 1. **ὧδε** gives the material, or rather ideal grounds, for the move, not the physical method or means (e.g. *νηυσί*).

ἕως μέν is answered by *ἐπεὶ δέ* . .

3. **τιμωρήσοντα**, to support, to assist; cp. 8. 169.

οἳ δέ presents a *δέ in apodosi*, and also with resumed subject; cp. 7. 51.

οἳ μέν: sc. *οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι*.

4. **ἐποίεον**, 'were acting, behaving in too long and leisurely a fashion'; cp. *δεινότερα ἐποίεε* 7. 1 *supra*.

ὃ δέ: sc. *ὁ Πέρσης*.

καὶ δή = *ἤδη*. Cp. Index.

Βοιωτίῃ ἐλέγετο εἶναι, οὕτω δὴ ὑπεξεκομίσαντό τε πάντα καὶ αὐτοὶ διέβησαν ἐς Σαλαμῖνα, ἐς Λακεδαίμονά τε ἔπεμπον ἀγγέλους ἅμα μὲν μεμψομένους τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι ὅτι περιεῖδον ἐμβαλόντα τὸν βάρβαρον ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀλλ' οὐ μετὰ σφέων ἠντίασαν ἐς τὴν Βοιωτίην, ἅμα δὲ ὑπομνήσοντας ὅσα σφι ὑπέσχετο ὁ Πέρσης μεταβαλοῦσι δώσειν, προεῖπαί τε ὅτι εἰ μὴ ἀμυνεῦσι Ἀθηναίοισι, ὡς καὶ αὐτοί τινα ἀλεωρὴν

7 *εὑρήσονται. οἱ γὰρ δὴ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὅρταζόν τε τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον καί σφι ἦν Ὑακίνθια, περὶ πλείστου δ' ἦγον τὰ τοῦ*

---

5 *τε* : *τότε* P 6 *ἐς Σαλαμῖνα* del. Cobet || *ἔπεμψαν* S, Schaefer, Bekker 7 *μεμψομένους* **ß** : *μεμφομένους* 8 *ἐσβάλλοντα* C : *ἐσβαλόντα* z 10 *σφι* : *σφίσι*? van H. || *προεῖπέ τε* C : *προεῖπέται* R 11 *ὡς* del. van H. **7.** 1 *ὤρταζόν* CPz 2 *δὲ* **ß**

---

5. **ἐλέγετο**, 'was being reported'; the evacuation of Attica might seem to have commenced as soon as Mardonios reached Chaironeia (the frontier town of Boiotia; cp. Plutarch, *Kimon* 1). But Mardonios may have negotiated from Thebes. In any case there is a chronological return in this c. to a point before that reached in c. 3 *supra*.

οὕτω δή, *tum demum*.

ὑπεξεκομίσαντο: cp. 8. 4 *ὑπεκτίθεσθαι*, 8. 41, 60 *ὑπεκκέεσθαι*.

6. **ἐς Λακεδαίμονά τε ἔπεμπον**, 'sending at the same time to L. . .'

7. **ἅμα μὲν . . ἅμα δέ**, strictly correlative; but **προεῖπαί τε** follows, with a change of construction (*anacoluthon*): (*ἔπεμπον*) *ἀγγέλους προεῖπαι* = *ἀγγελέοντας*.

8. **περιεῖδον**: cp. c. 41 *infra*, 7. 16 *supra*.

ἀλλ' οὐ, 'instead of . .'

10. **ὑπέσχετο** must be from *ὑπέχειν*, *ὑπέχεσθαι* or *ὑπίσχεσθαι*, cp. *ὑπίσχοντο* 7. 168, though Hdt. also uses the forms from *ὑπισχνέομαι* as in c. 109 *infra*; cp. *ὑπέσχε* 2. 151, *ὑπέχουσι* 4. 72, *ὑπίσχομαι* 7. 104, and *ὑπέσχετο* 2. 28 in a somewhat different and stricter sense.

μεταβαλοῦσι, 'if they changed sides': predicative and conditional participle.

11. **ὅτι . . ὡς**, "quarum altera abundat," Baehr; cp. 3. 71. Cp. App. Crit.

ἀλεωρή: found in Homer both of an act (*Il.* 24. 216) and of an object (21. 57, 15. 533); and in Aristophanes in the latter sense, *Wasps* 615.

7. 2. **Ὑακίνθια**: a three days' celebration, apparently common like the Karneian, to all Dorians, but certainly of pre-Dorian origin in the Peloponnese: Schoemann-Lipsius ii. (1902) 473. For the texts bearing upon the festival see Wide, *Lakonische Kulte* (1893) 285 ff. The feast was held during the Lakonian month Hekatombeus (Hesych. *s.v.* Ἑκατομβεύς) (not necessarily = Attic Hekatombaion: perhaps = Thargelion, reff. *ap.* Busolt ii.[2] 722). The cult implies a spring festival. The celebration lasted three days: on the first day the death of Hyakinthos was bewailed (Pausan. 3. 19. 3); on another day the women of Sparta brought a *Chiton* as an offering to the god of Amyklai (Pausan. 3. 16. 2); on another day (Athenaeus 139 *τῇ δὲ μέσῃ τῶν τριῶν ἡμερῶν*—but, if so, he omits to say what was done on the third) there was a great and joyous festival, with songs and dances, with sacrifice and banquet: presumably in honour of the apotheosis of Hyakinthos (*τὸν θεὸν ᾄδουσιν*), whom by that time it was very difficult to distinguish from his destroyer (Apollon). (Rawlinson seems to think the Hyakinthia lasted only one day, and that Midsummer-day.) Thucyd. 5. 23. 4 might favour an earlier date, in spring; but that would quite discredit the chronology of this story in Hdt., not indeed in itself a very strong objection. Busolt *l.c.* argues from Xenophon *Hell.* 4. 5. 1 ff. that the Hyakinthia were celebrated 'a few weeks at most' after the Isthmia, which he places in Μουνυχιών (tenth Attic month); but Xenophon's intervals are very ill-reckoning, nor does he say how long after the Isthmia or how long before

θεοῦ πορσύνειν· ἅμα δὲ τὸ τεῖχός σφι <ἤνετο>, τὸ ἐν τῷ Ἰσθμῷ ἐτείχεον, καὶ ἤδη ἐπάλξις ἐλάμβανε. ὡς δὲ ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὴν Λακεδαίμονα οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων, ἅμα ἀγόμενοι ἔκ τε Μεγάρων ἀγγέλους καὶ ἐκ Πλαταιέων, ἔλεγον τάδε ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐφόρους. "ἔπεμψαν ἡμέας Ἀθηναῖοι λέγοντες ὅτι ἡμῖν βασιλεὺς ὁ Μήδων τοῦτο μὲν τὴν χώρην ἀποδιδοῖ, τοῦτο δὲ συμμάχους ἐθέλει ἐπ' ἴσῃ τε καὶ ὁμοίῃ ποιήσασθαι [ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης], ἐθέλει δὲ καὶ ἄλλην χώρην πρὸς τῇ ἡμετέρῃ διδόναι, τὴν ἂν αὐτοὶ ἑλώμεθα.

---

3 <*ἤνετο*> Stein[3] 4 *ἤδη*: *δὴ* Schaefer, van H. || *ἐπάλξις* **a**: *ἐπάλξεις* 5 *Ἀθηνέων* **a**P, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *ἀθηναίων* 7 *ἐς τοὺς* **β** 10 *ἄνευ . . ἀπάτης* secl. Stein, repugn. Cobet, van H., Holder

---

the Hyakinthia the Amyklaians started home for the latter celebration in 390 B.C. (*al.* 392).

περὶ πλείστου δ' ἦγον, 'they considered it of utmost importance'; cp. *ἄξω* (*μέζονος*) 7. 150 *supra*. Cp. 5. 63 *τὰ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ πρεσβύτερα ἐποιεῦντο* (*ἢ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν*). The Hyakinthia again and again brought Spartan armies, or regiments, home from the field; cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 5. 11, Pausan. 3. 10. 1, 4. 19. 4.

3. **πορσύνειν** [**πόρω* or *πόρσω* = *πρόσω*, to 'further'?]: an epic, poetic, and solemn word; 'never found in comedy,' L. & S. The god is of course Hyakinthos, or Apollon.

ἅμα δέ: there is no antecedent *ἅμα μέν* to correspond; but the phrase, echoing as it does the terms of the Athenian message just above, makes a humorous appearance, perhaps undesigned.

τὸ τεῖχος. This wall at the Isthmos has been a most unconscionable time a-building, if it is only now, about midsummer, receiving the finishing touches, in the shape of its battlements (**ἐπάλξις**). Cp. 8. 71 *supra*. It had been begun immediately after (if not before) the disaster of Thermopylai, and the work had been pushed on at high pressure. It could not have taken longer to finish than the double wall all round Plataia, with battlements and towers to boot, erected in 429 B.C. in the course of the summer (Thuc. 2. 78, 3. 21). Had the Peloponnesians left this wall unfinished, on the retirement of the Persians, and only renewed and completed it on the advance of Mardonios in the spring of 479 B.C.?

5. **οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων**: an inaccuracy, or perhaps again an undesigned indication that this embassy is dated too late, if placed after the reoccupation of Athens by Mardonios. We can hardly discriminate by aid of the prepositions *ἀπό* and *ἐκ*: the Megarians and Plataians were doubtless in Salamis with the Athenians, or at any rate not at home in their own cities; or, if they were, then this embassy to Sparta took place in the early spring.

7. **ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐφόρους**: *ἐπελθεῖν* the correct term; cp. c. 5 *supra*. If they address the Ephors it is because the question is not of alliance, of peace or war, but merely a question of the mobilization, apparently a function of the Ephoralty; cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 3. 2. 23, etc. At the same time the Ephors were the presidents both of the *Gerousia* and of the *Apella*, and no doubt our authorities, Hdt. *imprimis*, may speak sometimes of the Ephors acting, where they acted really with Senate or Assembly; cp. Xenoph. *l.c.* Leotychidas, by the way, would appear to have been by this time at Aigina, or even Delos (8. 131–133), unless, indeed, it was in response to this spring embassy that the fleet was mobilized.

8. **βασιλεὺς . . ἀποδιδοῖ κτλ.**: this suits the early message of Mardonios 8. 140 *supra*, and would have been no news to the Spartans. If it is supposed to refer to the same offer, repeated by Morychides, c. 5 *supra*, Athens had rejected it again. But this repetition of the terms from 8. 140 is very tell-tale and inconsequent.

τοῦτο μὲν . . τοῦτο δέ: cp. Index.

ἡμεῖς δὲ Δία τε Ἑλλήνιον αἰδεσθέντες καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα δεινὸν ποιεύμενοι προδοῦναι οὐ καταινέσαμεν ἀλλ᾽ ἀπειπάμεθα, καίπερ ἀδικεόμενοι ὑπ᾽ Ἑλλήνων καὶ καταπροδιδόμενοι, ἐπιστάμενοί τε ὅτι κερδαλεώτερον ἐστὶ ὁμολογέειν τῷ Πέρσῃ μᾶλλον ἤ περ πολεμέειν· οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ ὁμολογήσομεν ἑκόντες εἶναι. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀπ᾽ ἡμέων οὕτω ἀκίβδηλον νέμεται ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐς πᾶσαν ἀρρωδίην τότε ἀπικόμενοι μὴ ὁμολογήσωμεν τῷ Πέρσῃ, ἐπείτε ἐξεμάθετε τὸ ἡμέτερον φρόνημα σαφέως, ὅτι οὐδαμὰ προδώσομεν τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ διότι τεῖχος ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ἐλαυνόμενον ἐν τέλεϊ ἐστί, καὶ δὴ λόγον οὐδένα τῶν Ἀθηναίων ποιέεσθε, συνθέμενοί τε ἡμῖν τὸν Πέρσην ἀντιώσεσθαι ἐς τὴν Βοιωτίην προδεδώκατε,

---

13 *ἀλλὰ πάντα τε* z 14 *ὑπὸ* **β** 15 *πέρσει* R 16 *εἴπερ* C 17 *ἀπ᾽ ἡμέων* : *ἡμέτερον* Pz || *ἀκίβδηλον ἐὸν* CPz 19 *ἐμάθετε* R 20 *οὐδαμᾶ* Rz 21 *ὅτι* **β**, Holder, van H. || *τὸ διὰ*? Stein[1 2] || *ἐν τέλεϊ ἐστι* Stein[1] : *ἐν τέλει ἐστὶ* AB : *ἐντελές ἐστι* z 22 *δὴ* : *δεῖ* C 23 *τῷ Πέρσῃ* Reiske : *τὸν Πέρσην* del. Krueger, Holder, van H.

---

12. **Δία . . Ἑλλήνιον** looks rather like an anachronism: the Zeus Hellenios or Panhellenios known at this period is the Aiginetan; cp. Pindar, *Nem.* 5. 15 (composed before the date of the battle of Salamis, cp. Mezger, *Pindars Siegerslieder*, p. 332). Were the Aiginetans represented in this embassy too (cp. 8. 60 *supra*), or have the Athenians generously adopted the Aiginetan title? cp. Farnell, *Cults*, i. (1896) 63. Anyway, the appeal from the local or Dorian cult to a pan-Hellenic deity (cp. 8. 144) is effective.

αἰδεσθέντες : cp. 7. 141 *supra.*

13. **οὐ καταινέσαμεν ἀλλ᾽ ἀπειπάμεθα,** 'we did not consent but refused'—a sort of *Hendiadys*! *καταινέειν*, cc. 33, 34 *infra*. *ἀπεῖπασθαι*, 7. 14 *supra.*

15. **κερδαλεώτερον,** in earlier Ionic 'shrewd,' 'crafty' (Homer, Archilochos); in Attic (Aristoph., Thucyd.), as here, 'advantageous,' 'profitable' (cp. L. & S.). **μᾶλλον** is *de trop.* The sentiment expressed is observable: the Athenians are still in heroic mood.

16. **οὐ μὲν οὐδέ,** 'not indeed that . .'

ἑκόντες εἶναι : cp. 7. 164 *supra.*

17. **τὸ μὲν ἀπ᾽ ἡμέων,** 'our conduct, our policy.' **ὑμεῖς δέ** supplies the contrast. *κίβδηλος*, 1. 66, 75, 5. 91, of oracles (Delphic), not as 'spurious' but as 'misleading,' deceitful.

νέμεται ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, 'is (being) exercised, conducted, towards the Hellenes' (with perfect honesty, without ambiguity); or *ἐπί*, distinctly locative, as in c. 95 *infra*, 'throughout Hellas'; or *coram*, 8. 79, cp. *ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐφόρους supra.*

18. **τότε** *prima facie* refers back to the scene laid at Athens in 8. 140–144, when the Lakedaimonians *κάρτα ἔδεισαν μὴ ὁμολογήσωσι τῷ Πέρσῃ Ἀθηναῖοι.*

20. **καὶ διότι** gives a further reason, parallel to *ἐπείτε* just above.

21. **ἐν τέλεϊ,** 'complete,' or 'near completion'; cp. *πρὸς τέλεϊ* c. 8 *infra* (and contr. *ἐν τέλεϊ* c. 106 *infra*).

22. **καὶ δή** : Stein follows Baehr in remarking that these words introduce the apodosis: no doubt—but why not $=$ *ἤδη* (with Krüger)? Cp. c. 6 *supra.*

λόγον οὐδ. π. : cp. 7. 13, 57, 218 *supra.*

συνθέμενοι . . τὴν Βοιωτίην : an express agreement (*σύνθημα* or *συνθήκη*) to this effect has not been actually recorded, but has been taken for granted; cp. 8. 144 *ad f.*

23. **προδεδώκατε** is rather strong language, both in matter and tense: a perfect, the effects of which are not past. **περιείδετε** : a particular act, on a particular occasion, the occasion being apparently the present invasion of Attica by Mardonios (not the previous occupation by Xerxes, to which the remark might have applied, cp. 8. 40 *supra*). These Athenian ambassadors, however, have

περιείδετέ τε προεσβαλόντα ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν τὸν βάρβαρον. ἐς μέν νυν τὸ παρεὸν Ἀθηναῖοι ὑμῖν μηνίουσι· οὐ γὰρ ἐποιήσατε ἐπιτηδέως. νῦν δὲ ὅτι τάχος στρατιὴν ἅμα ἡμῖν ἐκέλευσαν ὑμέας ἐκπέμπειν, ὡς ἂν τὸν βάρβαρον δεκώμεθα ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡμάρτομεν τῆς Βοιωτίης, τῆς γε ἡμετέρης ἐπιτηδεότατον ἐστὶ μαχέσασθαι τὸ Θριάσιον πεδίον.”
ὡς δὲ ἄρα ἤκουσαν οἱ ἔφοροι ταῦτα, ἀνεβάλλοντο ἐς τὴν 8
ὑστεραίην ὑποκρινέεσθαι, τῇ δὲ ὑστεραίῃ ἐς τὴν ἑτέρην· τοῦτο

---

24 *προεσβαλόντα* Stein: *ἐσβαλόντα* **β**Pz, Holder, van H.: *προσβαλόντα* **α**: *προσβάλλοντα* C 28 *ἐπεὶ γὰρ* C 29 *ἐπιτηδεότατόν* **α**: *ἐπιτηδέστατόν* **β**: *ἐπιτηδεώτατόν* ceteri || *ἐμμαχέσασθαι* **β**, Holder, van H. **8.** 1 *ἄκουσαν* z || *ἀνεβάλοντο* **β**CP, Holder 2 *ὑποκρινέεσθαι* Cobet, Stein[3]: *ὑποκρινεῖσθαι* van H.: *ὑποκρίνασθαι* **β**CPz, Stein[1 2], Holder: *ὑποκρίνεσθαι* **α**

---

left Athens (or Salamis) for Sparta before Mardonios had actually entered Attica (cp. c. 6 *supra*); and if they here rhetorically treat the invasion of Attica by Mardonios as a *fait accompli*, it is rhetoric, not strict history: how else could they proceed to call upon the Spartans to send an army back with them **ὡς ἂν τὸν βάρβαρον δεκώμεθα ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ**, to ‘receive’ the barbarian in Attica?

25. **ἐς μέν νυν τὸ παρεὸν . . νῦν δέ**: the antithesis between *τὸ παρεόν* and *νῦν* is not *prima facie* a sharp one; but *νῦν* is purely temporal, *τὸ παρεόν* is circumstantial. Again, *ἐς* might be taken ‘down to’ the present = *ἐς τὸ νῦν* (cp. *ἐς τόδε* 7. 29, but *ἐς τὸ παρεόν ibid.* not so): *νῦν δέ* is then distinct. *νῦν* qualifies *ἐκπέμπειν* rather than *ἐκέλευσαν*.

μηνίειν: cp. 7. 229.

26. (**οὐκ**) **ἐπιτηδέως** is a *meiosis*; *leniter dicta* (Schweighaeuser).

ὅτι τάχος = *ὡς τάχος* 5. 106. Cp. Thuc. 7. 42. 3.

ἅμα, *simul*, *simul cum* = *σύν* but stronger.

27. **δεκώμεθα**: cp. 8. 28 *supra*.

28. **ἡμάρτομεν τῆς Βοιωτίης**: they were too late to ‘receive’ him in Boiotia, but there was still time to ‘receive’ him in the Thriasian plain. This argument likewise points to an earlier date for the embassy.

29. **τὸ Θριάσιον πεδίον**: cp. 8. 65 *supra*. If Mardonios was already at Athens the Peloponnesian forces could not count on getting into the Thriasian plain, for Mardonios would doubtless be in possession of Eleusis; unless, indeed, he had entered Attica by Dekeleia or Phyle, and omitted to use or occupy the pass of Dryoskephalai: not a very probable hypothesis.

The advantages of the Thriasian plain as a battle-field, from the Peloponnesian point of view, are open to discussion: if the Greeks could have encountered Mardonios as he emerged from the pass of Eleutherai-Eleusis they might have scored a local success, but they would have had to hold the sacred way by Daphne and the route between Aigaleos and Parnes (crossed by Archidamos in 431 B.C., Thuc. 2. 19. 2), while on the plain itself the Persian cavalry would have ridden round them. This plain was never one of the great battle-fields of Greece. The Greek fleet could not have been of much service in the case.

8. 1. **ἄρα**, ‘well,’ not without surprise; cp. Index. Abicht regards the particle here as marking an advance in the action (or inaction!).

ἀναβάλλεσθαι, *differre*, 6. 86 etc.

2. **τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ δέκα ἡμέρας ἐποίεον**: i.e. for a whole (Greek) week; cp. c. 40 *infra*. There is an *Asyndeton*. The next words, **ἐξ . . ἀναβαλλόμενοι**, are not otiose (*pace* Stein), for, without them, the sentence might mean (in spite of the imperf. *ἐποίεον*) that they postponed the answer ‘for a week’ (i.e. twelve days in all). Meanwhile they were working away at the wall across the Isthmos; cp. c. 7 *supra* (*bis*), which is even yet not quite finished! If **πάντες Πελοποννήσιοι** (i.e. Π. *πανδημί*)

καὶ ἐπὶ δέκα ἡμέρας ἐποίεον, ἐξ ἡμέρης ἐς ἡμέρην ἀναβαλλόμενοι. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἐτείχεον σπουδὴν ἔχοντες πολλὴν πάντες Πελοποννήσιοι, καί σφι ἦν πρὸς τέλεϊ. οὐδ᾽ ἔχω εἰπεῖν τὸ αἴτιον διότι ἀπικομένου μὲν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος ἐς Ἀθήνας σπουδὴν μεγάλην ἐποιήσαντο μὴ μηδίσαι Ἀθηναίους, τότε δὲ ὤρην ἐποιήσαντο οὐδεμίαν, ἄλλο γε ἢ ὅτι ὁ Ἰσθμός σφι ἐτετείχιστο καὶ ἐδόκεον Ἀθηναίων ἔτι δέεσθαι οὐδέν· ὅτε δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀπίκετο ἐς τὴν Ἀττικήν, οὔκω ἀπετετείχιστο, ἐργάζοντο δὲ
9 μεγάλως καταρρωδηκότες τοὺς Πέρσας. τέλος δὲ τῆς τε ὑποκρίσιος καὶ ἐξόδου τῶν Σπαρτιητέων ἐγένετο τρόπος τοιόσδε. τῇ προτεραίῃ τῆς ὑστάτης καταστάσιος μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι Χίλεος ἀνὴρ Τεγεήτης, δυνάμενος ἐν Λακεδαίμονι μέγιστον ξείνων, τῶν ἐφόρων ἐπύθετο πάντα λόγον [τὸν

6 εἶπαι **ϐ**z, van H. 8 ὥρην CPz 9 οὐδὲ μίαν **α** : οὐδὲ μίην **ϐ** : οὐδεμίην z 10 δεῖσθαι **α**CPz, Holder, van H. || οὐδενός **ϐ** || ὁ ἀλέξανδρος CPz 11 οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν εἰ ἐτετείχιστο Marc. **9.** 4 χίλεως Marc.: Χείλεως Plutarch. Mor. 871 : Χίλεος οὐνόματι z || τεγεήτϊς R 5 ἐφόρων ἕνα z || τὸν . . ἔλεγον secl. Stein², Holder

were at the Isthmos, building or no building, they surely had arms with them. The building operations at this point may be put down to Hdt. They are not required to keep the Peloponnesians at home, but he seems to think the action of the Peloponnesians to have been determined simply by the state of the building.

6. **οὐδ᾽ ἔχω εἰπεῖν τὸ αἴτιον διότι κτλ.**, 'I cannot state the reason why . .' *αἴτιον*: cp. 7. 125.

8. **ὤρη** here is plainly = *σπουδή* (cp. 1. 4, 3. 155), a poetic word; cp. *ὀλίγωρος*, *ὀλιγωρία*.

9. **ἐτετείχιστο**: a strictly temporal pluperfect, reinforced in *ἀπετετείχιστο*.

10. **δέεσθαι οὐδέν**, 'to have no need of . .' (*μηδέν* was possible here, but not obligatory, as the governing verb is not itself in a form or construction which requires *μή* for its negation, Madvig § 205.)

12. **μεγάλως καταρρωδηκότες**: the abject and utter terror of the Peloponnesians is expressed in fourfold fashion: (*a*) by the strong word *ὀρρωδέω* (*ἀρρ-*); (*b*) by the preposition in comp.; (*c*) by the 'perfect' tense; (*d*) by the adverb. Probably Hdt. found all this in the *Attic Sources*.

9. 1. **τέλος δέ**: adverbial, 'at last.'

2. **ὑπόκρισις** = Attic *ἀπόκρισις*; cp. 1. 116. Aristot. *Eth. N.* 3. 10. 4 = 1118 A clearly shows the Attic meaning. Hdt. never uses the word *ὑποκρίτης*.

ἔξοδος is practically a technical military term; cp. cc. 19, 26 *infra*, 7. 223 *supra*; Thuc. 2. 10. 1, Xenoph. *Hell.* 1. 2. 17.

ἐγένετο τρόπος τοιόσδε, 'took the following turn,' 'occurred on this wise.'

3. **κατάστασις**: as in 3. 46, not as in 8. 141 *supra*.

4. **Χίλεος**: the name appears in Plutarch *de Hdti. m.* 41 (*Mor.* 871), *Themist.* 6, as Χείλεως, in Polyain. 5. 30 as Χίλιος, a form (Chilius) used by Cicero (*ad Att.* 1. 9. 2, 12. 2, 16. 15) of a later poet. What Chileos was doing in Sparta neither Hdt. nor Plutarch nor Polyainos reports. His critique of the ephoral policy was notorious; but who first let it out? The situation demanded is really a meeting of the Symmachoi at Sparta—there may very well have been one in the winter or spring, or about the Feast of the Hyakinthia—and the remarks of Chileos were made in that Synod; if the Ephors were specially addressed, it was merely as the presiding magistrates.

δυνάμενος: of power, influence; cp. 7. 5 *supra*.

5. **ξείνων**: not used in the Spartan sense, given c. 11 *infra*.

δὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔλεγον]· ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Χίλεος ἔλεγε ἄρα σφι τάδε. "οὕτω ἔχει, ἄνδρες ἔφοροι· Ἀθηναίων ἡμῖν ἐόντων μὴ ἀρθμίων τῷ δὲ βαρβάρῳ συμμάχων, καίπερ τείχεος διὰ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ἐληλαμένου καρτεροῦ, μεγάλαι κλισιάδες ἀναπεπτέαται ἐς τὴν Πελοπόννησον τῷ Πέρσῃ. ἀλλ' ἐσακούσατε, πρίν τι ἄλλο Ἀθηναίοισι δόξαι σφάλμα φέρον τῇ Ἑλλάδι." ὁ μέν σφι ταῦτα συνεβούλευε· οἳ δὲ φρενὶ **10** λαβόντες τὸν λόγον αὐτίκα, φράσαντες οὐδὲν τοῖσι ἀγγέλοισι τοῖσι ἀπιγμένοισι ἀπὸ τῶν πολίων, νυκτὸς ἔτι ἐκπέμπουσι πεντακισχιλίους Σπαρτιητέων καὶ ἑπτὰ περὶ ἕκαστον τάξαντες

---

6 ταῦτα om. **β**Pz, Holder, van H. || ὁ Χίλεος del. van H., Holder 7 οὕτως **α** || ἡμῖν <μὲν> van H., Holder 8 μὴ ἐόντων **β** || τῶδε τῶ βαρβάρω R: (τῷδε τῷ β. S: τῷ δὲ τῷ β. V ap. Gaisf.) 9 κρατεροῦ z 10 ἀναπεπταίαται A¹B || ἐσακούσετε B 11 πρὶν <ἤ> τι van H. || τῇ ἑλλάδι φέρον Pz **10.** 1 ἐν φρενὶ **β**z 3 ἀπηγμένοισι B 4 πεντακισχιλίων **β** || καὶ . . εἱλώτων om. **β**, expung. Wesseling, van H.

πάντα λόγον, 1. 21.

7. **ἄρα**: much to their surprise; cp. c. 8 *supra*.

8. **ἐόντων μὴ ἀρθμίων**: cp. 7. 101 (*tot. verb.*), and καὶ ἐὼν μὴ Μηλιεύς 7. 214.

9. **μεγάλαι κλισιάδες ἀναπεπτέαται**, '(the) doorways stand wide open'—lit. large 'shutters' have been unfolded; μ. may well be predicative; the tense is, of course, without temporal prejudice, and essentially present. The verb occurs with gates, gateways of the Samian akropolis, 3. 147 ἀναπετάσας τὰς πύλας, and of Babylon 3. 158, and well describes the operation of opening double or folding doors, gates. Cp. *Iliad* 12. 120 ff. where (πύλῃσιν) σανίδες ἀναπεπταμέναι are contrasted with ἐπικεκλιμέναι. In 21. 531 the simple verb occurs (πεπταμένας πύλας ἔχετε). κλισιάδες, or κλεισιάδες, might be street-doors (as in Plutarch, *Poplic.* 20) or chamber-doors, like the κληισταὶ σανίδες πυκινῶς ἀραρυῖαι δικλίδες in the ὑψόροφος θάλαμος of Odysseus (*Od.* 2. 344). The significance of the metaphor ('the Open Door') here is obvious, its force undeniable. Blakesley points out that Plutarch copies it three times (*Aristeid. et Cat. Comp.* 2, *Alcibiad.* 10, *de Isid.* 23 = *Mor.* 360 A), as St. Paul twice, 1 *Cor.* 16. 9, 2 *Cor.* 2. 12.

10. **ἐσακούειν**, c. 60 *infra*. **ἄλλο** is euphemistic. **σφάλμα φ.**, cp. 7. 6. **δόξαι**, 'be decreed.'

As Rawlinson points out, there is nothing new in the remarks of Chileos to the Ephors (except the metaphor!); the Athenians themselves have more than hinted it above, c. 7. Placed in the high summer of 479 B.C. the remarks of Chileos are sadly belated; but placed at a meeting either of the Spartan Symmachy in the winter 480–79 or even at the Hyakinthia in the (late) spring, they are much to the point, as giving an Arkadian's view of the relative value of the wall at the Isthmos and the alliance of the chief sea-power.

10. 1. **φρενὶ λαβόντες τὸν λόγον**: cp. νόῳ λαβών 3. 41. φρήν (or φρένες) is unusual in prose; in 3. 134 Hdt. directly contrasts αἱ φρένες with τὸ σῶμα.

2. **αὐτίκα . . νυκτὸς ἔτι**: their ἔξοδος by night appears to be treated as part of the sudden and secret change of policy; it is more likely to have been a wise precaution to get over as much ground as possible in the cool (hardly to get start of the Argives; but cp. c. 11 *infra*).

3. **ἀπιγμένοισι**, 'still in Sparta.'

τῶν πολίων: sc. ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων, ἐκ Μεγάρων, ἐκ Πλαταιέων c. 7 *supra*; yet the 'cities' are *ex hypothesi* in the hands of Mardonios. But *ubi cives ibi civitas!* Cp. c. 5 *supra*.

4. **πεντακισχιλίους Σπαρτιητέων**: 5000 did not exhaust the total available citizen-force; cp. 7. 234 *supra*; but it is virtually the levy πανδημί, of two-thirds (from twenty to forty-five years of age). The figure here is no doubt a round one, but may be accepted as

τῶν εἱλώτων, Παυσανίῃ τῷ Κλεομβρότου ἐπιτάξαντες ἐξάγειν. ἐγίνετο μὲν ἡ ἡγεμονίη Πλειστάρχου τοῦ Λεωνίδεω· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἦν ἔτι παῖς, ὁ δὲ τούτου ἐπίτροπός τε καὶ ἀνεψιός. Κλεόμβροτος γὰρ ὁ Παυσανίεω μὲν πατὴρ Ἀναξανδρίδεω δὲ

5 ἐπιτρέψαντες **B**, Holder, van H. 6 ἐγένετο **a**, Stein[1] || μέν νυν ἡ **B**, Holder, van H. 7 ἀνεψιὸς κλεόμβροτος· κλεόμβροτος γὰρ R 8 Παυσανίω van H.

substantially correct; what cannot be allowed to pass is the assertion that they took 35,000 Helots with them, seven Helots in attendance on (**περί**) each Spartiate, by special order (**τάξαντες**). There may be some sense in this figure, but not as here stated. Pausanias was not well-supplied with *ψιλοί*, cp. c. 60 *infra* (but cp. c. 28 *infra*), so these Helots are probably not fighting men, badly as such were wanted; doubtless large numbers of Helots were employed on the commissariat service, cp. c. 39 *infra*—roughly speaking some 30,000—and this *Army Service Corps* is here represented as all accompanying the citizen-militia. Or, again, the figure may represent an estimate of the total number of Helots employed in any capacity during the campaign, or during the war (in ships etc.), which Hdt. has misunderstood and misapplied; cp. Appendix VIII. § 2 (iv.).

5. **Παυσανίῃ τῷ Κλεομβρότου**: the question of command was not settled by the Ephors but by the Apella; cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 2. 9. Pausanias, son of Kleombrotos (mentioned 8. 3 *supra* without patronymic; perhaps therefore in a passage added afterwards; but cp. note *ad l.*), cannot have been an old man at this time; but the fact that he is of age to be Regent, and to command a Spartan army in the field, rather supports the view that his father, Kleombrotos, and his uncle, Leonidas, were twins; cp. 7. 205 *supra* and note to l. 8 *infra*. The relationship of the persons here mentioned may be accurately exhibited:—

Dorieus	Leonidas	Kleombrotos
|	|	|
Euryanax	Pleistarchos	Pausanias

Dorieus, Leonidas and Kleombrotos being full *ἀδελφοί* and being the younger brothers of Kleomenes, the son of their father's (Anaxandridas) second wife; cp. *l.c. supra*.

6. **ἐγίνετο μὲν ἡ ἡγεμονίη**: i.e. by custom or prescriptive right the actual king would have had the command, the leading. Leotychidas was already in command of the fleet; cp. 8. 131 *supra*; if Pleistarchos had been in command of the army, the arrangement would apparently have conflicted with the 'law' reported by Hdt. 5. 75, albeit the 'law' might refer to one and the same force only, and even so, was hardly quite strictly observed (cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 5. 3. 10). But Hdt. in this passage is not concerned with any such scruples, and Bk. 5 is probably of later composition than this passage; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

Πλειστάρχου τοῦ Λεωνίδεω: Pleistarchos was the son of Leonidas and Gorgo, and so the grandson of Kleomenes on the spindle side. Anaxandridas was both his grandfather and his great-grandfather. His exact age is a matter of doubt, but he was still apparently a minor at the time of the fall of Pausanias = 472–1 B.C., Thuc. 1. 132. 1.

7. **ἐπίτροπός τε καὶ ἀνεψιός**: Baehr has here made a curious blunder from misunderstanding Pausan. 3. 5. 1; he says, *successerat nimirum Pleistoanax Pleistarcho qui regno initio abierat*. Why, Pleistoanax was the son of Pausanias, and could only succeed in his father's right! Pausanias himself was never king (nor is he called so by Aristotle, *pace* Clinton *Fasti* ii.[3] 261, though so described sometimes by orators, lexicographers, and modern scholars; cp. c. 5 *supra*). Pleistarchos was still king in 472 B.C.; cp. previous note. *ἐπίτροπος*, cp. 7. 170 *supra*, and for the meaning here 1. 65. *ἀνεψιός*, 'first cousin' here; cp. 7. 82.

8. **Κλεόμβροτος . . ἀπέθανε**, 'Kleombrotos (had) died shortly after leading home the army which (had) built the wall at the Isthmos.' He was no doubt in the first instance 'Regent,' or guardian to Pleistarchos. The much debated wall here appears as a *fait accompli* before

παῖς οὐκέτι περιῆν, ἀλλ' ἀπαγαγὼν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ τὴν στρατιὴν τὴν τὸ τεῖχος δείμασαν μετὰ ταῦτα οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον τινὰ βιοὺς ἀπέθανε. ἀπῆγε δὲ τὴν στρατιὴν ὁ Κλεόμβροτος ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ διὰ τόδε· θυομένῳ οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ Πέρσῃ ὁ ἥλιος ἀμαυρώθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. προσαιρέεται δὲ ἑωυτῷ Παυσανίης Εὐρυάνακτα τὸν Δωριέος, ἄνδρα οἰκίης ἐόντα τῆς αὐτῆς.

11 *Οἳ μὲν δὴ σὺν Παυσανίῃ ἐξεληλύθεσαν ἔξω Σπάρτης· οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι, ὡς ἡμέρη ἐγεγόνεε, οὐδὲν εἰδότες περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου*

10 *τὴν* om. **B**C || *πολλόν τινα χρόνον* **B**, Holder, van H.: *ἔτι* coni. Stein 11 *ἀπήγαγε* Cobet, van H. 13 *προσερέεται* **B** 14 *ὁ παυσανίης* **B** || *ἄνδρα* del. van H. **11.** 1 *ἐξεληλύθησαν* Cz 2 *ἰδόντες* C

Kleombrotos returned to Sparta in 480 B.C.! In c. 8 *supra* it is still being hurried on in the spring—or, as some would have it, after midsummer of 479 B.C. See note *ad l.*

13. **ὁ ἥλιος ἀμαυρώθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.** Zech attempted to make out that *ἀμαυρώθη* did not imply an eclipse. Nothing short of an eclipse (not necessarily total) would account for the act of Kleombrotos. Plutarch, *Caesar* 69, uses *ἀμαύρωμα* similarly. Petavius dated this eclipse 2nd Oct. 480; Hoffmann and Lamp *ap.* Busolt ii.[2] 715 n. 1 agree in the date, and time the maximum obscuration at Korinth to 2.20 P.M. (a partial eclipse). Stein very ingeniously suggests that the *θυσίη* was made, after Salamis, on the question of intercepting the retreat of the Persian land-forces from Attica.

With **οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον τινὰ βιούς** cp. 5. 48 *οὐ (γάρ) τινα πολλὸν χρόνον ἦρξε ὁ Κλεομένης.* The sense best taken is that Kleombrotos died comparatively young. He can hardly have been less than fifty, or his son could scarcely have succeeded him as *ἐπίτροπος* and *ἡγεμών.* But the statement suggests that Pausanias was about as juvenile as a Regent could be.

προσαιρέεται δὲ ἑωυτῷ: there is something very curious in this arrangement. The Spartans will scarcely have allowed the *ἡγεμών* to select a colleague at his own free will. Perhaps Pausanias was barely of age to assume the great responsibilities of his position, and an older man, of the Herakleid lineage, was associated with him in virtual command, though nominally Pausanias had the supreme honours; perhaps the great victory, for which Pausanias claimed (Thuc. 1. 132. 2) and obtained (c. 64 *infra*) all the credit, was more due to the intelligence of his cousin; if, indeed, there was not a still greater intelligence in the background. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 9.

14. **Εὐρυάνακτα τὸν Δωριέος** appears again in cc. 53, 55; as Dorieus was the eldest of the three brothers, Euryanax was probably senior to Pausanias. Why had he not succeeded Leonidas, or, for that matter, Kleomenes, as son of the next eldest son? Dorieus may have renounced, or forfeited, the right of succession; or a king's son (Leonidas, Pleistarchos) may have succeeded in preference to a *privatus*; cp. 7. 3, where Demaratos lays down a law, which may be illustrated by, or generalized from, the case of Euryanax.

Rawlinson has an erroneous but very instructive note on this passage. He attempts to prove that the Dorieus here mentioned cannot be Dorieus son of Anaxandridas for two reasons: (1) Had Dorieus left a son in Sparta "he would undoubtedly have succeeded to the throne"—but no! see above. (2) "The words of Hdt. imply a more distant relative." Nay, the saddle is on the wrong horse! Hdt. in Bks. 5 and 9 follows different sources; had he known the story of Dorieus when he wrote this passage he must have guarded his readers against the error into which Rawlinson has fallen; in other words, this passage makes strongly for the *earlier composition of Bks.* 7, 8, 9. Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

11. 1. **ἐξεληλύθεσαν:** before any one, the Athenians for example, knew of it.

2. **ἐγεγόνεε:** not until after daybreak.

ἐπῆλθον ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐφόρους, ἐν νόῳ δὴ ἔχοντες ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑωυτοῦ ἕκαστος· ἐπελθόντες δὲ ἔλεγον τάδε. “ὑμεῖς μὲν ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι αὐτοῦ τῇδε μένοντες Ὑακίνθιά τε ἄγετε καὶ παίζετε, καταπροδόντες τοὺς συμμάχους· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὡς ἀδικεόμενοι ὑπὸ ὑμέων χήτεϊ τε συμμάχων καταλύσονται τῷ Πέρσῃ οὕτω ὅκως ἂν δύνωνται· καταλυσάμενοι δέ, δῆλα γὰρ ὅτι σύμμαχοι βασιλέος γινόμεθα, συστρατευσόμεθα ἐπ’ ἣν

4 ἐπὶ τῆς Pz 7 χήτεϊ z: χήτει **α**R: χήτι CPSV, van H. || τε om. **β** 8 οὕτως **α** 9 γὰρ δὴ z || ὅτι εἰ S || βασιλῆος z || γενόμεθα **β**C || ἐπ’ ἣν: ἐπὶ ἣν ABC: ἐπὶ τὴν PRVz, Holder, van H.

These pluperfects are temporal. The ambassadors, or convoys, must include those from Megara and Plataia; but the spokesman is plainly Athenian.

3. **ἐπῆλθον**: cp. c. 7 *supra.*

ἐν νόῳ δὴ ἔχοντες, ‘intending at last’ (Blakesley).

4. **καὶ αὐτοί** as well as the army, though of its departure they knew nothing; or, as well as the representatives of the various allies assembled in Sparta, Chileos, and the rest?

ἐπὶ τὴν ἑωυτοῦ ἕκαστος: was there only one ambassador from each city? Plutarch (*Arist.* 10) makes Aristeides the Athenian one, but gives very good evidence (‘the psephism of Aristeides’) that Athens had three representatives, Kimon, Xanthippos, Myronides. The mention of Xanthippos dates the embassy before the muster of the fleet at Aigina, 8. 131.

5. **αὐτοῦ τῇδε**, ‘here on the spot.’

Ὑακίνθιά τε ἄγετε καὶ παίζετε. The title of the festival is anarthrous, idiomatically; cp. Κάρνεια 7. 206, Ὀλύμπια δὲ καὶ Κάρνεια 8. 72. *ἄγειν celebrare* 8. 26, etc. *παίζειν* here can hardly be used as a scoff (cp. 4. 77), but as in Pindar *Ol.* 13. 86 *ἐνόπλια χαλκωθεὶς ἔπαιζεν* (orchestic); or *Ol.* 1. 16 *μουσικᾶς ἐν ἀώτῳ, οἷα παίζομεν.* Cp. Aristoph. *Frogs* 407 *παίζειν τε καὶ χορεύειν*, 442 *παίζοντες οἷς μετουσία θεοφιλοῦς ἑορτῆς* etc.; cp. 5. 4 *supra.*

7. **ὡς** *quippe*, 7. 22 *supra.*

χήτεϊ, from *χῆτος* (the form *χῆτις, χήτι* also read), a strictly Homeric word; cp. *χατέω, χατίζω.*

καταλύσονται τῷ Π. οὕτω ὅκως ἂν δύνωνται: for *καταλύεσθαι* cp. 7. 6, 8. 140 *supra.* Even in such phrases as these the reference of *οὕτω* is not of necessity forwards, but might rather be carried backwards. The sequence here, future indic. followed by pres. subj., is observable. Cp. just below *συστρατευσόμεθα . . ἂν ἐξηγέωνται . . μαθήσεσθε . . ἂν ἐκβαίνῃ*, the last of which is the most remarkable; the construction is perhaps attracted by the preceding instances.

9. **σύμμαχοι βασιλέος γινόμεθα** (N.B. the tense). This threat and announcement comes with startling rapidity after the ‘lynching of Lykidas’ in c. 4 *supra*, and puts both the Athenians and the Spartans in a very unfortunate and probably false position. The notion that the Peloponnesian forces were only mobilized at the eleventh hour under threat of ‘medism’ on the part of Athens is highly improbable. (i.) If Mardonios is in Attica, or even in Boiotia, then in all probability a Spartano-Peloponnesian force is already at the Isthmos—if only to defend the wall. (ii.) The threat here is entirely subversive of the heroics in 8. 144, and even in c. 7 *supra.* (iii.) The more probable date of the Hyakinthia, in spring, militates against this *ultimatum.* (iv.) The subsequent relations of Athenians and Spartans during the campaign are against it. (v.) The ultimatum is in itself an absurdity: the point at issue is really one of detail, as to the exact *modus operandi*; the Athenians could not doubt the substantial *bona fides* of the Spartans, with the king in command of the fleet at Aigina. (vi.) The notion is too comic that 5000 Hoplites and 35,000 Helots had mobilized and marched without any of the Athenian, Plataian, or Megarian envoys getting wind of it, or having a single friend in Sparta to inform them. Probably there was a good deal of friction and misgiving between Athens and Sparta during the winter and spring after Salamis and before Plataia: it cannot be said that

ἂν ἐκεῖνοι ἐξηγέωνται. ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν μαθήσεσθε ὁκοῖον ἄν τι ὑμῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκβαίνῃ." ταῦτα λεγόντων τῶν ἀγγέλων, οἱ ἔφοροι εἶπαν ἐπ' ὅρκου καὶ δὴ δοκέειν εἶναι ἐν 'Ορεσθείῳ στείχοντας ἐπὶ τοὺς ξείνους. ξείνους γὰρ ἐκάλεον τοὺς βαρβάρους. οἱ δὲ ὡς οὐκ εἰδότες ἐπειρώτων τὸ λεγόμενον, ἐπειρόμενοι δὲ ἐξέμαθον πᾶν τὸ ἐόν, ὥστε ἐν θώματι γενόμενοι ἐπορεύοντο τὴν ταχίστην διώκοντες, σὺν δέ σφι τῶν περιοίκων

---

10 *ἐξηγέονται* B 11 *ἐκβαίνει* C : *ἐκβαίη* **B** || *ταῦτα δὲ* **B** 12 *ἐφόρκου* **a** || *ὀρεστΐω* R : *ὀρεστείω* SV : *ὀρεστείῳ* Marc. *z* 13 *στίχοντας* **B** || *ξείνους . . . βαρβάρους.* nonne tollenda ? cf. comment. || *ἐκάλουν* **B** 14 *οἱ δὲ* Stein[1] : om. C || *ἐπειρώτων* **a**, Stein[2], Holder : *ἐπειρώτεον* **B**, Stein[1], van H. : *ἐπηρώτων* CP : *ἐπηρώτεον* *z* 15 *ἐπηρόμενοι* (C)*z* || *θώματι* (C)S, Stein[2], van H. : *θώματϊ* V : *θώυματι* **a**R, Stein[1], Holder

---

either party comes very well out of this story, which is told more or less at the expense of both parties, perhaps by this or that ally — Arkadian, Epidaurian, Megarian, Aiginetan, or so forth ! Cp. further Appendix VIII. § 3.

10. **ἐκεῖνοι** : sc. *οἱ Πέρσαι.*

11. **ἐξ αὐτοῦ** : sc. *βασιλέος* ? But, as *ἐκεῖνοι* has intervened, perhaps *αὐτοῦ* is used more vaguely 'thereout' : sc. of our alliance with the Persian.

ταῦτα λεγόντων τῶν ἀγγέλων : the speech just delivered only takes account of the case of Athens ; Plataia and Megara being ignored—as also the mobilization of the fleet !

12. **ἐπ' ὅρκου** = *σὺν ὅρκῳ* very unusual ; and the more remarkable as *ἐπιορκεῖν* means 'to forswear' (4. 68), though *ἐπομνύναι* (8. 5) not so.

καὶ δὴ δοκέειν εἶναι : the subject of *εἶναι* will be *τοὺς σφετέρους ἄνδρας* or sim. *καὶ δή* with *εἶναι* = *ἤδη*. Cp. c. 6 *supra.* **στείχειν** is an eminently Ionic, or Epic, or poetic word.

ἐν 'Ορεσθείῳ. Pausanias 8. 3. 2 gives *'Ορεσθάσιον* as the original name of this place, *'Ορέστειόν τε ἀπὸ 'Ορέστου κληθεῖσα τοῦ 'Αγαμέμνονος.* The change of name may belong to the same 'movement' and date as discovered the bones of 'Orestes' in Tegea for the benefit of the Spartans, 1. 67 f. Orestes was henceforward the canonized founder of 'Oresteion' (cp. Eurip. *Orest.* 1647, *Electr.* 1273). In reality Oresthasion was the capital town or village of the Oresthis (cp. Thuc. 4. 134. 1), itself a portion of the Mainalia (Thuc. 5. 64. 3 ; cp. Pausan. 8. 27. 3) or mountainous region between the plains of Tegea and the later Megalopolis, the watershed between Alpheios and Eurotas. The remains of the city lay to the right of the route from Megalopolis to Tegea (Pausanias 8. 44. 2), and quite off the direct road from Sparta to the Isthmos (via Tegea, Mantineia, etc.). Rawlinson suggests that this roundabout route was selected in order to effect a junction with a contingent from the Lepreatis, surely an unnecessary arrangement. Perhaps all the forces from Sparta did not take one and the same route : those that started first may have been sent by the longer road. Or could it be that they took the longer way round to avoid the Argives ? Cp. next c. (In days of yore the Oresthasioi had done 'yeoman's' or rather 'heroic service' in the wars between Arkadia and Sparta ; cp. Pausan. 8. 39. 3 ff., 41. 1.)

13. **ξείνους γὰρ ἐκάλεον τοὺς βαρβάρους.** This appears to me to be a gloss, introduced from c. 55 *infra* : the imperfect *ἐκάλεον* suits. Stein observes that the Spartans applied the term not merely to *βάρβαροι* but to all foreigners (cp. *ξενηλασία*), as the Romans *hostis.*

14. **ἐπειρώτων τὸ λεγόμενον,** 'inquired their meaning . . ,' cp. 3. 22. *εἰρωτᾶν, εἴρεσθαι* are the Ionic forms ; cp. *ἐπειρώτησις* c. 44 *infra.*

15. **πᾶν τὸ ἐόν** : 7. 209 *supra.* **ὥστε . . ἐπορεύοντο,** Madvig § 166.

ἐν θώματι γενόμενοι, 'after recovering from their astonishment.' (The aorist seems to have almost perfect or pl.p. force.)

16. **ἐπορεύοντο τὴν ταχίστην διώκοντες** : cogn. acc. Their object was to overtake the Van ; they were accompanied

Λακεδαιμονίων λογάδες πεντακισχίλιοι ὁπλῖται [τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ἐποίεον].

12 Οἳ μὲν δὴ ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἠπείγοντο· Ἀργεῖοι δὲ ἐπείτε τάχιστα ἐπύθοντο τοὺς μετὰ Παυσανίεω ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ Σπάρτης, πέμπουσι κήρυκα τῶν ἡμεροδρόμων ἀνευρόντες τὸν ἄριστον ἐς τὴν Ἀττικήν, πρότερον αὐτοὶ Μαρδονίῳ ὑποδεξάμενοι σχήσειν τὸν Σπαρτιήτην μὴ ἐξιέναι· ὃς ἐπείτε ἀπίκετο ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἔλεγε τάδε. "Μαρδόνιε, ἔπεμψάν με Ἀργεῖοι

17 Λακεδαιμονίων del. van H., Holder || ὁπλῖται om. **B**, Holder, van H. || τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ἐποίεον secl. Stein, Holder, van H. **12.** 4 αὐτῷ **B** 5 ἐπείτε : ἐπεὶ **B** : om. C

by 5000 picked hoplites of the Lakedaimonian Perioikoi, who tried to keep up with them and overtake the Van.

17. **τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ἐποίεον** — rather a bathos! Cp. App. Crit.

It is not asserted that the Rear overtook the Van at Orestheion: probably not, for they would go the shorter and more direct route (*τὴν ταχίστην supra*).

12. 1. **Ἀργεῖοι δέ.** The medism of the Argives was a serious matter for Sparta, and helps to account for the apparent weakness of her policy and action in this campaign. It cannot, however, have been very ardent, or the Argives would have made more of their opportunity, when the Spartans actually did leave the Peloponnesos; cp. 8. 73 *supra*. It was even a service in disguise to Greece, sealing the Spartans more surely to the good cause!

ἐπείτε τάχιστα ἐπύθοντο: how soon was that? Had they *Proxenoi*, or friends in Sparta, to inform them, or was it only when the Spartan army was marching past their own borders? **ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ Σπάρτης** might perhaps mean 'had crossed the border'; cp. c. 17 *infra*.

2. **τοὺς μετὰ Π.**, 'Pausanias and his men.'

3. **κήρυκα** (not *ἄγγελον*, cp. 7. 1).

ἡμεροδρόμων: cp. 6. 105. The story would be more convincing if the name of this crack runner had been preserved; cp. 6. 105.

4. **ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν . . ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας**: while the Athenian, Plataian, and Megarean envoys have been kicking their heels in Sparta, Mardonios has *ex hypothesi* reoccupied Athens, c. 3 *supra*.

πρότερον αὐτοὶ Μαρδονίῳ ὑποδεξάμενοι: according to this story the Argives were pledged to Mardonios to keep the Spartans at bay. If true, this pledge implies previous negotiations between the Persian and the Argives, of which nothing further has transpired. It was a very pretty plan, or a very pretty commentary on a want of plan. Had the Argives really been co-operating with the Persian to that extent they might have made it impossible for Sparta to send 10,000 Hoplites and 40,000 Helots beyond the Isthmos. Argos observed neutrality, perhaps a neutrality benevolent towards the 'barbarian'; but Sparta must have been well assured that a real neutrality would be observed before she denuded Lakonia of fighting men. A forgotten chapter in Greek diplomacy might have recorded the *pourparlers* between Athens, Argos and Sparta during the winter, or spring, which convinced the Greeks that they had no active hostility to expect from Argos: Salamis made a deeper impression upon Argos than upon Thessaly and Boiotia, powers which took their cue from the fiasco at Thermopylai. The embassy, whose absurd and pitiful record has just been given above, may have been better employed in squaring Argos than in denouncing Sparta.

αὐτοί may best be taken with *σχήσειν*.

6. **ἔλεγε τάδε.** How this *ἡμεροδρόμος* got past the Isthmos wall, which was no doubt guarded from sea to sea, Hdt. does not say: the problem does not exist for him. The message is desperate: Mardonios would have had something to say in reply, before he allowed the messenger to depart, on Argive impotence and breach of faith; except, indeed,

*φράσοντά τοι ὅτι ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος ἐξελήλυθε ἡ νεότης, καὶ
ὡς οὐ δυνατοὶ αὐτὴν ἔχειν εἰσὶ Ἀργεῖοι μὴ οὐκ ἐξιέναι.
πρὸς ταῦτα τύγχανε εὖ βουλευόμενος." ὁ μὲν δὴ εἴπας ταῦτα* **13**
*ἀπαλλάσσετο ὀπίσω, Μαρδόνιος δὲ οὐδαμῶς ἔτι πρόθυμος ἦν
μένειν ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ὡς ἤκουσε ταῦτα. πρὶν μέν νυν ἢ
πυθέσθαι ἀνεκώχευε, θέλων εἰδέναι τὸ παρ' Ἀθηναίων, ὁκοῖόν
τι ποιήσουσι, καὶ οὔτε ἐπήμαινε οὔτε ἐσίνετο γῆν τὴν Ἀττικήν,
ἐλπίζων διὰ παντὸς τοῦ χρόνου ὁμολογήσειν σφέας· ἐπεὶ δὲ
οὐκ ἔπειθε, πυθόμενος πάντα λόγον, πρὶν ἢ τοὺς μετὰ*

---

7 *σοι* **a**C (*τε* S) || *ἐλήλυθεν* C 8 *αὐτοὶ* **B** || *ἴσχειν* **B**, Holder, van H.: *σχεῖν*? Stein || *Ἀργεῖοι* secl. van H. **13.** 3 *ἤκουε* C || *μὲν γὰρ*? van H. || *ἢ* om. **B**Pz: *ἢ* **a** 4 *ἀνοκώχευε* van H. || *παρὰ* **a** 5 *ἐπήμαινε* <*αὐτοὺς*> van H. || *ἐσινέετο* **B** 6 *τοῦ χρόνου* del. Cobet, van H. 7 *τὸν πάντα* **B**P, Stein[1], Holder, van H. || *πρινὴ* ABR: *πρηνὶ* S

---

that Mardonios' chief wish must have been to draw the Peloponnesians into Boiotia, which is not the point of view of the anecdote.

7. **ὅτι ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος ἐξελήλυθε ἡ νεότης**, 'the Lakedaimonian militia has crossed the border'—a frequent formula, perhaps, in Peloponnese! *νεότης*, a collective term, here apparently includes all men liable for service abroad; cp. Thuc. 2. 8. 1 etc. and 7. 13 *supra*.

8. **ὡς οὐ δυνατοὶ αὐτὴν ἔχειν . . μὴ οὐκ ἐξιέναι**: a genuine example of the double negative *μὴ οὐ*: cp. Index. *ἔχειν* (the strong) = 'hold,' 'with-hold,' 'prevent' (cp. Index), itself a negation! just before, *σχήσειν . . μὴ ἐξιέναι*, where, however, the action is contingent and future, while here it is present, or, indeed, if the Argive would only confess it honestly, past: a consideration which may help to account for the positive *οὐκ*.

9. **τύγχανε εὖ βουλευόμενος**, 'hit upon a good plan (by yourself!)': if true, could any message be more fatuous, under the circumstances? With the expression cp. 8. 101 *ὁκότερα ποιέων ἐπιτύχω εὖ βουλευσάμενος*. The imperative here is a rude or peremptory optative.

13. 2. **Μαρδόνιος δέ** had no mind to stay in Attica once he was assured that the Peloponnesians would cross the Isthmos; that assurance can hardly have been conveyed to him by the Argives, unless, indeed, the Spartans had taken them into the secret; he convinced himself, perhaps, by becoming aware of movements from the Isthmos (cp. c. 14 *infra*), perhaps by *pourparlers* with the Athenians, perhaps by information obtained through Greeks in his camp, that a large force was under arms; and he apparently retired in hopes that the Greeks would follow him into Boiotia, where the ground was more favourable to cavalry, his base nearer, and an attack on the Greeks, as they emerged from the passes into the plain, feasible. He may, not to say must, have made sure of their debouching by the pass of Dryoskephalai.

3. **πρὶν . . ἢ πυθέσθαι ἀνεκώχευε**: *πρὶν ἤ* with infin. just below again, as in c. 68 *infra*; without *ἤ* 8. 144 *supra*, c. 101 *infra*. *ἀνακωχεύειν* is used trans. 7. 36 *supra* (of ropes), 6. 116 (of ships); here apparently intransitively: 'stayed, held his hand,' or possibly 'refrained from acts of hostility' = 'observed an armistice'; cp. Thuc. 1. 40. 4 *Κορινθίοις μέν γε ἔνσπονδοί ἐστε, Κερκυραίοις δὲ οὐδὲ δι' ἀνοκωχῆς πώποτ' ἐγένεσθε*, 5. 32. 7 *Κορινθίοις δὲ ἀνοκωχὴ ἄσπονδος ἦν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους*, 5. 25. 3 *μετ' ἀνοκωχῆς οὐ βεβαίου ἔβλαπτον ἀλλήλους τὰ μάλιστα*.

4. **εἰδέναι . . ὁκοῖόν τι ποιήσουσι**: the normal prose construction; cp. c. 11 *supra*.

τὸ παρ' Ἀθηναίων: ellipse; cp. c. 7 *supra*.

5. **οὔτε ἐπήμαινε οὔτε ἐσίνετο**: the former word is poetical, the latter prosaic.

7. **πάντα λόγον**: cp. c. 9 *supra*. **πρὶν ἢ . . ἐσβαλεῖν** looks like an approximately precise date. Hdt. seems to assume that the wall was undefended, the Isthmos ungarrisoned—that is incredible. If Mardonios retired

Παυσανίεω ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἐσβαλεῖν, ὑπεξεχώρεε ἐμπρήσας τε τὰς Ἀθήνας, καὶ εἴ κού τι ὀρθὸν ἦν τῶν τειχέων ἢ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἢ τῶν ἱρῶν, πάντα καταβαλὼν καὶ συγχώσας. ἐξήλαυνε δὲ τῶνδε εἵνεκεν, ὅτι οὔτε ἱππασίμη ἡ χώρη ἦν ἡ Ἀττική, εἴ τε νικῷτο συμβαλών, ἀπάλλαξις οὐκ ἦν ὅτι μὴ

---

8 ἐσβαλεῖν **B**, Stein², Holder, van H.: ἐμβαλεῖν || τε: δὲ Apr. C 11 δὲ om. **a**Cz || εἵνεκα z || ἡ post ἦν om. C

---

before Pausanias reached the Isthmos, it was perhaps inferred that he retired because he had heard that Pausanias was on the march, and so, again, that the Argives must have told him.

8. **ὑπεξεχώρεε**: sc. *αὐτοῖς*: he went out of Attica to avoid them; cp. Plato, *Phaid.* 103 D *προσιόντος τοῦ θερμοῦ ἢ ὑπεκχωρήσειν αὐτῷ ἢ ἀπολεῖσθαι* (sc. *τὴν χιόνα*).

ἐμπρήσας τε . . καὶ . . πάντα κτλ., 'but not until he had fired Athens, and thrown down and demolished (*συγχώσας*, cp. 7. 225) every morsel whether of the (city) walls, the (private) houses, or the (holy) temples, which was still standing upright'—i.e. plainly after the previous demolition by Xerxes, 8. 50–53 *supra*; for *ὀρθόν* cp. Thuc. 5. 42. 2. Hdt. says nothing of any rebuilding in the meanwhile. **τῶν τειχέων** might be taken to support the view that Athens was a walled town in 480 B.C. (cp. E. Gardner, *Ancient Athens* (1902) pp. 46 ff., who does not, however, cite this instance); but of course it only proves at most that Hdt. thought so; nor does it even prove that, for 'the walls' here might be those of the Akropolis; or even if the city-walls, would not prove that the circuit was complete in 480 B.C. or that a siege of Athens was a military possibility; cp. further Appendix VI. § 1.

Rawlinson well remarks that this account of the destruction of Athens by Mardonios is exaggerated; Thuc. 1. 89. 3 leaves some of the houses (*οἰκίαι*) standing, and even portions of the city-wall (*τοῦ περιβόλου βραχέα*). Pausanias (1. 18. 1, 20. 2) mentions temples older than the Persian war. Col. Leake (*Athens and the Demi*, i. 12) points out the great difficulties of such total destruction as Hdt. asserts. More recent excavations have shown that even on the Akropolis a good deal was left standing when the Persians departed. Mardonios had neither time nor zeal for such wholesale annihilation; it was only a 'Restoration' that could make away with the past so utterly! Cp. 8. 50–53 *supra*.

11. **τῶνδε εἵνεκεν.** Hdt. surpasses himself, and gives the military reasons for the evacuation of Attica with the precision of a professor of the *Sach-Kritik*! The reasons are three in number, and admit of development.

(i.) The Persian's strength lay in his cavalry; Boiotia was better adapted than Attica to cavalry operations (Hdt. says nothing of a great superiority in infantry).

(ii.) Attica was difficult to evacuate in case of defeat. The point is not fully or very clearly put; but at any rate Mardonios is not counting on success as a foregone conclusion.

(iii.) He wished to be nearer his base in Thebes. The reason is not quite clearly put; speaking generally it is better to fight in your enemy's than in your friend's territory. Mardonios, however, was thinking of his commissariat, and also perhaps of the loyalty, or potential disloyalty, of Greece in his rear; in case of defeat a position north of Kithairon was better from this point of view. Artabazos might never have effected his masterly retreat (c. 89 *infra*) if the great battle had been fought on the Thriasian or even on the Athenian plain. The argument as a whole was purely strategic, and Hdt. does well not to ascribe to Mardonios the policy of limiting the Persian frontier of the Hellenic satrapy *in posse* to the Kithairon-Parnes line (*pace* G. B. Grundy, *Great Persian War*, p. 450).

ἦν: the tense carries back to the historic situation.

12. **εἴ τε νικῷτο . . οὐκ ἦν**, 'should he be defeated . . there was no . .' The construction is irregular but clear, and even more forcible than stricter grammar would have been.

ἀπάλλαξις is very rare; Hdt. uses

κατὰ στεινόν, ὥστε ὀλίγους σφέας ἀνθρώπους ἴσχειν. ἐβουλεύετο ὦν ἐπαναχωρήσας ἐς τὰς Θήβας συμβαλεῖν πρὸς πόλι τε φιλίῃ καὶ <ἐν> χώρῳ ἱππασίμῳ.

Μαρδόνιος μὲν δὴ ὑπεξεχώρεε, ἤδη δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐόντι 14
αὐτῷ ἦλθε ἀγγελίη πρόδρομον ἄλλην στρατιὴν ἥκειν ἐς Μέγαρα, Λακεδαιμονίων χιλίους· πυθόμενος δὲ ταῦτα ἐβουλεύετο [θέλων] εἴ κως τούτους πρῶτον ἕλοι. ὑποστρέψας δὴ τὴν

---

13 καὶ ὀλίγους **B**z, Holder, van H. 15 ἐν Schweighaeuser, van H., Stein[3] || χώρῳ Stein[(1)], van H., Stein[3]: χώρῃ **14.** 1 ὑπεχώρεεν **B** || τῇ abesse malit van H. 2 πρόδρομον Schweighaeuser: πρόδρομος 4 θέλων om. cod. unus et alter, del. Reiske, Schaefer, Cobet, van H., Stein[3] || δὴ Stein[3], Holder: δὲ

ἀπαλλαγή in 7. 207, 8. 39, 118 *supra*, '(means of) getting away.'

ὅτι μὴ κατὰ στεινόν, except by a strait, a narrow pass. There are really three passes from Attica into Boiotia: (1) Dekeleia-Oropos, (2) Phyle-Panakton, (3) Eleusis-Eleutherai-Erythrai. Taking in the whole Boiotian frontier from sea to sea, two further passes may be added: (4) the direct road or route from Megara to Plataia, and (5) the route round the end of Kithairon *via* Aigosthena-Kreusis. Cp. Grundy, *G.P.W.* pp. 445 ff., and 8. 113. 2 *supra*. The route by Eleutherai has a fork, the left prong of which goes to Plataia, so that from the Boiotian side the number of apparent passes would be raised to six. This fact is of importance on the battle-field of Plataia; but, if defeated in the Thriasian plain, the invaders could not use (3) at all, and if defeated east of Aigaleos could only use (1). In any case (2) was very difficult; cp. Xenoph. *Mem.* 3. 5. 25 ὅτι πρόκειται τῆς χώρας ἡμῶν ὄρη μεγάλα, καθήκοντα ἐπὶ τὴν Βοιωτίαν, δι' ὧν εἰς τὴν χώραν εἴσοδοι στεναί τε καὶ προσάντεις εἰσί, καὶ ὅτι μέση διέζωσται ὄρεσιν ἐρυμνοῖς.

13. **ἀνθρώπους**, not even ἄνδρας.

15. **ἱππασίμῳ** refers merely to the space for evolutions (not to the grass for fodder); cp. 2. 108.

14. 2. **ἦλθε ἀγγελίη**: who brought this intelligence? Doubtless his own scouts and cavalry. Probably the arrival of this information, or perhaps an ineffectual attempt to capture Megara—no doubt a well-walled city—encouraged Mardonios to hope that the Greeks would follow him into Boiotia; the next news, that they were in full force at the Isthmos, convinced him.

πρόδρομον ἄλλην στρατιὴν ἥκειν ἐς Μέγαρα Λακεδαιμονίων χιλίους. This may not have been the whole force; there had been but 300 'Spartans' at Thermopylai; perhaps this was really the *avant-garde* of the whole army, and Mardonios would feel that unless he was prepared to do battle in Attica, the time had come to retire. πρόδρομον and ἄλλην are not quite consistent; ἄλλην is relative to the previous message of the Argives; πρόδρομον is a bit of information which might or might not have been reported to Mardonios, but at any rate shows that the force at Megara was not a *tertium quid*, but a portion of the *levée en masse*. See, however, App. Crit. Mardonios is next credited with a wish, a plan, and an attempt to catch or capture this force (**ἕλοι**, Homeric; cp. *Il.* 2. 37 Πριάμου πόλιν, 13. 42 νῆας 'Αχαιῶν, 21. 102 πολλοὺς ζωούς). To do so he returns apparently on his tracks (**ὑποστρέψας**) and leads his whole force against Megara. Such conduct is inconsistent with his deliberate intention to withdraw into Boiotia, for the good and sufficient reasons set forth in the previous chapter. Possibly Mardonios fought a 'rear-guard action,' or sought to retard the advance of the Peloponnesians, while he evacuated Attica. He could not view with equanimity the penetration of Boiotia by the Peloponnesian army (*via* Dryoskephalai) before he had evacuated Attica, even though Thebes was probably held, and held strongly, by a Persian (or Makedonian) garrison; nor did he desire to fight the great battle in Attica at all. His cavalry, or a few squadrons of cavalry, employed in harrying the Megarid, doubtless retired either by Dryoskephalai or even

στρατιὴν ἦγε ἐπὶ τὰ Μέγαρα· ἡ δὲ ἵππος προελθοῦσα κατιππάσατο χώρην τὴν Μεγαρίδα. ἐς ταύτην δὴ ἑκαστάτω τῆς Εὐρώπης τὸ πρὸς ἡλίου δύνοντος ἡ Περσικὴ αὕτη στρατιὴ ἀπίκετο.

15 *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Μαρδονίῳ ἦλθε ἀγγελίη ὡς ἁλέες εἴησαν οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐν τῷ Ἰσθμῷ. οὕτω δὴ ὀπίσω ἐπορεύετο διὰ Δεκελέης· οἱ γὰρ βοιωτάρχαι μετεπέμψαντο τοὺς προσ-*

---

5 προελθοῦσα **B**: προσελθοῦσα 6 δὲ **B** || ἑκαστάτωι **a**P 7 στρατιὴ αὕτη **a** **15.** 1 ταῦτα del. van H. || ἧκε Pz 3 δεκελέης RS: δεκελείης || βοιώταρχοι? van H.

---

by Aigosthena into Boiotia, while the main column marched by the eastern pass or passes; see next chapter.

5. **ἐπὶ τὰ Μέγαρα**: apparently Megara, unlike Athens, was fully fortified, and strongly held. No previous attack upon it has been mentioned; and the Megarid had escaped a Persian visitation in the previous year, improbable as such immunity may in itself appear, cp. 8. 70. The loss of Megara was treated by Themistokles, 8. 60, as the certain consequence of the evacuation of Salamis: *per contra*, the victory at Salamis may have saved the city. Even now only the χώρα suffers. That would practically be the plain lying between the Kerata, Geraneia, and the two seas. The city itself possessed two citadels (Pausan. 1. 39. 5, 42. 1): hence perhaps the plural form of the name.

6. **ἐς ταύτην δὴ . . ἀπίκετο.** "Here was the furthest point in Europe towards the setting sun to which this Persian army ever penetrated," Rawlinson. "This was the *furthest* point [not 'the *westernmost*'] of Europe, looking westward, which was reached" (by this army of Persians), Blakesley. "This was the furthest land in Europe towards the sun-setting to which this Persian army came," Macaulay. Blakesley is no doubt right in saying that the emphasis is not on the exact orientation, but on the distance; nevertheless the orientation is given, and involves Hdt., or his cartographer, unwittingly in error. Hdt. evidently conceives of Central Greece as running approximately north and south (cf. his orientation of Thermopylai 7. 176). It did not occur to him, when he wrote this passage, that not merely was Delphi (visited *ex hypothesi* by the Persians, 8. 35) far to the west of the Megarid, but that the whole route of the Persian forces in Central Greece, Mardonios' march from Thessaly in this very spring, had lain west of the point here marked as the furthest point of Europe in the west reached by the Persian arms. The orientation, then, breaks down equally whether Hdt. meant by the words *αὕτη στρατιή* the army (cp. 6. 12 where it is used absolutely for *πεζὸς στρατός*) of Xerxes or the army of Mardonios; and this passage evidently belongs to a *composition to be dated before Hdt.'s own visit to Europe*, to Delphi, Thebes and Central Greece, and was left standing, perhaps by oversight, after he must have known better (perhaps like the Thermopylai orientation). Cp. Introduction, § 9. Hdt. certainly did not mean that another Persian army had penetrated further, i.e. further westwards, into Europe; but he may have had in his mind the possibilities that other Persian armies had penetrated further into Europe, to wit, northward, or north-eastwards (having regard to his conception of the continent); and he probably has no special intention of distinguishing here the army of Mardonios from the army of Xerxes.

15. 1. **ἦλθε ἀγγελίη**: counting the Argive in c. 12, this is the third express message that reaches Mardonios; his own intelligence department, or the medizing Greeks, will have procured it. This message is not quite correct: the Athenians only joined the 'Hellenic' army at Eleusis c. 19 *infra*; but it marks probably the union of the rest of the Peloponnesians with the Spartans (ib.) or *vice versa*.

3. **διὰ Δεκελέης.** Dekeleia (*δῆμος τῆς Ἱπποθοωντίδος φυλῆς* Steph. B. *sub v.*) is placed by Thuc. 7. 19. 2 at 120 stades from Athens, and a very little more from Boiotia: its position is further defined by this passage, as on the eastern

χώρους τῶν Ἀσωπίων, οὗτοι δὲ αὐτῷ τὴν ὁδὸν ἡγέοντο ἐς Σφενδαλέας, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἐς Τάναγραν· ἐν Τανάγρῃ δὲ νύκτα ἐναυλισάμενος, καὶ τραπόμενος τῇ ὑστεραίῃ ἐς Σκῶλον, ἐν γῇ

---

5 ἐς ταναγρην RSV, Gaisford, Palm || ἐν ταναγόρηι C 6 κῶλον Paris. 1635, *z*

---

road from Athens into Boiotia, and its exact position (modern *Tatói*) is proved by Inscripp. and by remains *in situ*. A chapter in its legendary history is given below, c. 73.

βοιωτάρχαι: this is the earliest express mention of the 'Boiotarchs,' a body which reappears in Thucydides (4. 91. 1, cp. 2. 2. 1), Xenophon (*Hell.* 3. 4. 4 *βοιώταρχοι, sic*), and the later writers. They were evidently important, probably superior officers of the Boiotian League, and their existence is synchronous therewith: the number of the Board is doubtful (Eleven in Thuc. *l.c.*, Seven in Diodor. 15. 52, =371 B.C. Leuktra, etc.) and may have varied at different times; they were elected annually (entering on office in winter). Cp. G. Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* ii. (1885) 54 f., to which later efforts (e.g. Pauly-Wissowa *sub v.*) have added little. These officers, or some of them, were now in attendance on Mardonios, as they 'sent for' men from the Asopos valley to act as guides (Athenians were either not to be found, or not to be trusted: the Athenian *émigrés* were apparently not with Mardonios). Guides might have been needful on the Phyle-Panakton route: were they needed for the routes by Dekeleia and by Eleutherai? And how had Mardonios and his men found their way into Attica? Or had they learnt nothing of the routes in the previous year?

4. **Ἀσώπιοι**: an *Hapaxlegomenon*?= *Παρασώπιοι*, Strabo 409, who also uses the term *Παρασωπία* for the land either side the upper and middle Asopos (cp. *infra*), but does not appear to carry the term so far down as Tanagra.

5. **Σφενδαλέας**: Steph. B. *sub v.* *Σφενδάλη. δῆμος Ἱπποθοωντίδος φυλῆς. ὁ δημότης, Σφενδαλεύς.* Sphendale does not play much part in Attic history, and its exact position has been disputed. Leake (*Athens and the Demi*, ii. 123) placed it "near" Hagios Merkurios, but "at" *Malakasa*, on the road from Aphidna to Tanagra, apparently in agreement with Finlay, cp. *op. c.* p. 124 n. Pauly, *R.E.* vi. (1852) i. 1375, appears to be in error on this point. Bursian i. (1862) 336, "near *Kakosialesi*" (which Leake *l.c.* describes as "the only site that could compete with Malakása as the site of Sphendale") "at the foot of an isolated and extensive hill, the Hyakinthos (now *Kotróni*), on which the Ὑακινθίδες παρθένοι (cp. Suidas *s.v.* Παρθένοι) were worshipped, Attic maidens who had voluntarily taken their own lives to secure victory for Athens against Boiotia." (This position Leake regards as beyond the Attic frontier.)

Τάναγραν: the position of Tanagra, on the left bank of the Asopos, near the junction of the Thermodon (c. 43 *infra*) is quite certain; Leake, *N.G.* ii. 463, Bursian i. 222. Some of the natives believed the old name of the city to be Graia, cp. Hom. *Il.* 2. 498, until the still older name was 'restored' to it; cp. Strabo 404, Pausan. 9. 20. 2, Steph. B. *sub v.*, who also gives Ποιμανδρία as a former name. The population was 'Gephyraian,' cp. 5. 57, and was never perhaps wholly 'Boiotized': are not the charming terra-cottas, that have popularized the city's name in our day, rather Ionic than 'Boiotian'? After the humiliation of Thebes Tanagra apparently "aspired for a time to the leadership of the Boiotian confederacy," B. Head, *Hist. Num.* 295; cp. *Coinage of Boiotia*, p. 20. That ambition was foiled by the restoration of Thebes after the great battle in 457 B.C., Thuc. 1. 108. 1–3; but Tanagra survived most of the members of the Boiotian League, cp. Strabo 410.

νύκτα ἐναυλισάμενος: 1. 181.

6. **τραπόμενος τῇ ὑστεραίῃ ἐς Σκῶλον**: cp. Strabo 408 *ἔστι κώμη τῆς Παρασωπίας ὑπὸ τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι, δυσοίκητος τόπος καὶ τραχύς, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ παροιμία εἰς Σκῶλον μήτ' αὐτὸς ἴναι (ἴμεν) μήτ' ἄλλῳ ἕπεσθαι.* Its ruins were seen (?) by Pausanias (9. 4. 4) "about 40 stades" below the bridge across the Asopos. The town is named in the Catalogue (*Il.* 2. 47, 496), and figures in the Spartano-Theban wars of the fourth century; Xen. *Hell.* 5. 4. 49, *Ages.* 2. 22.

τῇ Θηβαίων ἦν. ἐνθαῦτα δὲ τῶν Θηβαίων καί περ μηδιζόντων ἔκειρε τοὺς χώρους, οὔτι κατὰ ἔχθος αὐτῶν ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀναγκαίης μεγάλης ἐχόμενος ἔρυμά τε τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ποιήσασθαι, καὶ ἢν συμβαλόντι οἱ μὴ ἐκβαίνῃ ὁκοῖόν τι ἐθέλοι, κρησφύγετον τοῦτο ἐποιέετο. παρῆκε δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ στρατόπεδον

---

7 θηβαίω ἦν **B** 8 οὔτε Bekker || αὐτέων *z* 9 ἐχόμενος· βουλόμενος **B**P^{m}*z*, Holder: βουλόμενος Cobet, van H. || στρατῶι B^{2}CP 10 οἱ: οὐ C || θέλῃ **B**: ἐθέλει *z* 11 τοῦτο ἐποιέετο del. Cobet, van H.

Strabo 409 reckons all the *Παρασώπιοι* (to wit, the men of Σκῶλος, Ἐτεωνός, Ἐρυθραί, Ὑσιαί) as subject to Thebes; in that sense, when Mardonios turned (if he did turn) up the river, and recrossed it to Skolos, he would there be *ἐν γῇ τῇ Θηβαίων*. Hdt., however, does not keep him long at Skolos, but passes him on to the camp or *Laager* described below, which was not at Skolos, nor even on the same side of the river as Skolos. Possibly there is some error or confusion in the account of the retirement of Mardonios from Attica; or rather, is it possible there should not be? Hdt. apparently assumes that Mardonios takes all his forces into Attica—not a probable assumption—and that Mardonios takes them all in, and all out, by one route, and one route only—a still less probable assumption (cp. 8. 113). Skolos evidently lies at the Boiotian end of the middle or direct route from Athens to Thebes. If Mardonios found himself at Skolos it was probably because he himself came out of Attica by this route. More than one, perhaps all three routes out of Attica, may have been used—not to say the route by Aigosthena from Megara, c. 14 *supra*. That the 'Asopioi' acted as guides favours this suggestion. If Mardonios himself came by the easier route from Dekeleia to Tanagra, he probably went on to Thebes, or else to the Laager, by the left bank. The only diarial hint for the march is the night spent in Tanagra, and the next day. Probably nights were also spent at Dekeleia (12 miles from Athens), at Sphendale (7–8 miles from Dekeleia), as well as at Tanagra (11–12 miles from Sphendale). (Skolos would be about 9 miles up the Asopos.)

7. **τῶν Θηβαίων . . ἔκειρε τοὺς χώρους**: probably not the Thebais proper, but the 'places' on the Asopos, the Parasopia, *in ditione Thebanorum*; cp. *supra*. "Agros Thebanorum vastavit," Schweighaeuser; so too Stein, cp. 3. 58. *κείρειν*, 7. 131, 8. 32, 65 *supra*.

8. **ὑπ' ἀναγκαίης μεγάλης ἐχόμενος**, 'with absolutely no free will in the matter.' The construction at this point is a little faulty. Stein apparently takes **ποιήσασθαι** as dependent on *ὑπ' ἀναγ. ἐχόμενος* = *ἀναγκαζόμενος*. Some inf. codd. (followed by some editors; cp. App. Crit.) insert *βουλόμενος*—a very sorry device. I should be inclined to take the infinitive as pendent, or telic, or exegetical (cp. Index, for parallels); in any case the transition to **ἐποιέετο** is harsh, and perhaps the omission of *ποιήσασθαι* would be the simplest remedy. *ἐποιέετο* is repeated below in a different construction and sense; here middle ('was having made,' or perhaps 'looked upon,' 'considered'): there passive ('was being constructed').

9. **ἔρυμα**: cp. 7. 223 *supra*.

10. **ἢν . . μὴ ἐκβαίνῃ ὁκοῖόν τι ἐθέλοι τοῦτο ἐποιέετο**: a notable sequence for a conditional sentence. The apprehension of a disaster has already received expression c. 13 *supra*.

κρησφύγετον: 5. 124. The actual construction of this Laager is not so precisely described as that of the *ἕρκος* and *τεῖχος* at Mykale, cc. 97, 102 *infra*.

11. **τὸ στρατόπεδον**: plainly the Laager, which was much more extensive than the *τεῖχος, ἔρυμα, κρησφύγετον*. 'This Laager reached (**παρῆκε**) from Erythrai (where it began) along past Hysiai, and extended (**κατέτεινε**, cp. 8. 31) into the territory of Plataiai, stretching (or 'posted' if *τεταγμένον* be retained) along the Asopos river. The fortified part of it was of less extensive construction, being about ten stades to each front.'

This passage makes it clear that the Laager was much larger than the fortified *Praetorium*, and that the fortified portion had a measurement of upwards of a square mile; but the exact size

ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἐρυθρέων παρὰ Ὑσιάς, κατέτεινε δὲ ἐς τὴν Πλαταιίδα γῆν, παρὰ τὸν Ἀσωπὸν ποταμὸν τεταμένον. οὐ

12 Ἐρυθραίων z 13 περὶ τὸν z || τεταμένον Reiske, Holder, van H., Stein[3]: τεταγμένον

---

and appearance of the camp are not described, and a large number of other problems are left unresolved.

(1) Was the τεῖχος square? Hdt. may perhaps mean this, for otherwise he should have given the measurements of the other sides, or flanks; and *prima facie* each side of a fort is a μέτωπον. Elsewhere in similar cases he is more particular to specify quadrature, e.g. of Babylon, 1. 178 ἐοῦσα μέτωπον ἕκαστον εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν σταδίων ἐούσης τετραγώνου: 2. 124 of a pyramid, τῆς ἐστὶ πανταχῇ μέτωπον ἕκαστον ὀκτὼ πλέθρα ἐούσης τετραγώνου.

(2) Was the Laager on one side, or on both sides the Asopos; and in what part of the Laager was the Fort? The Fort was on the left bank of the Asopos, for the Persians cross the river to reach the Greeks c. 59 *infra*; and the wooden Fort is ἐν μοίρῃ τῇ Θηβαΐδι, c. 65 *infra u.v.*; but cp. l. 6 *supra*. Stein[5] places the Fort south of Asopos in the neighbourhood of Skolos, but Skolos has nothing to say to the camp as described by Hdt. nor to the battle; the mention of Skolos above is to be otherwise accounted for. Probably the fortified camp was close to the river, and to the bridge across the Asopos, the *tête du pont* on the south side being no doubt strongly fortified and held; the rest of the Persian lines would lie behind, and away from the river, and no part of the Laager proper would be on the right bank of the river. The main road to Thebes will have passed through the camp, possibly dividing it in half; the 10 stades may be the measurement of the river front, which was all palisaded; the palisading probably went all round the 'Fort,' and the Fort may have been square.

(3) It is quite certain that no part of Mardonios' Laager or Fort actually touched the towns of Erythrai and Hysiai, for these places are presently in possession of the Greeks cc. 19, 25 *infra*. The description here given of the extent of the Persian camp must be understood either (*a*) to be based upon a report of the appearance of the Persian camp as seen from the Greek lines above, which enclosed Erythrai, and afterwards Hysiai; or (*b*) to mean that the Laager (though north of Asopos) occupied ground belonging to the two townships named, and extended further into Plataian territory north of Asopos. But for two reasons the former explanation is to be preferred: (1) the contrast here between the names of the towns and the specification of Πλαταιὶς γῆ: (2) the doubt whether the territory of Erythrai and Hysiai did extend to the further bank of the stream, which was probably all Theban. The first reason may be further enforced by the supposition that the name of Plataiai is avoided because Plataiai was in ruins; the second, by the observation that the Thebans had only been driven across the Asopos by the Athenians in or about 509 B.C., the river being then made the frontier between the Thebais on the one side and the Plataiis and Hysiatis on the other; 6. 108 *supra*.

12. **ἀπὸ Ἐρυθρέων παρὰ Ὑσιάς**: there is little room for doubt that Leake, *N.G.* ii. 329, located these towns much too far east, and that they occupied sites in close proximity to the main roads from Eleusis-Eleutherai to Thebes and to Plataia; Erythrai probably commanded the main road to Thebes, while Hysiai, about a mile further west, commanded the branch to Plataia; cp. cc. 22, 25 *infra*, and G. B. Grundy, *G.P.W.* pp. 458 ff.

13. **τὸν Ἀσωπὸν ποταμόν**: to be distinguished from the Malian stream of the same name (7. 199, etc.), as also from a river by Sikyon (Ἀσωπὸς ὁ παραρρέων τὴν Σικυῶνα καὶ ποιῶν τὴν Ἀσωπίαν χώραν, μέρος οὖσαν τῆς Σικυωνίας, Strabo 382). There was also an Asopos in Paros, *ibid.* The Boiotian Asopos rises near Leuktra and flows eastwards into the sea near Oropos (ὁ παρὰ Θήβας ῥέων καὶ Πλαταιὰς καὶ Τάναγραν, Strabo, *ib.*) along the skirts of Kithairon (Strabo 409), a relatively large and fertilizing stream (Ἀσωπὸν δ' ἵκοντο βαθύσχοινον λεχεποίην *Il.* 4. 383) liable to sudden floods in spring (ὁ γὰρ Ἀσωπὸς ποταμὸς ἐρρύη μέγας καὶ οὐ ῥᾳδίως διαβατὸς ἦν Thuc. 2. 5. 2), for ever a φίλον πίασμα Βοιωτῶν χθονί (Aischyl. *Pers.* 806).

μέντοι τό γε τεῖχος τοσοῦτο ἐποιέετο, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπὶ δέκα σταδίους μάλιστά κῃ μέτωπον ἕκαστον.

16 Ἐχόντων δὲ τὸν πόνον τοῦτον τῶν βαρβάρων, Ἀτταγῖνος ὁ Φρύνωνος ἀνὴρ Θηβαῖος παρασκευασάμενος μεγάλως ἐκάλεε ἐπὶ ξείνια αὐτόν τε Μαρδόνιον καὶ πεντήκοντα Περσέων τοὺς λογιμωτάτους, κληθέντες δὲ οὗτοι εἵποντο· ἦν δὲ τὸ δεῖπνον ποιεύμενον ἐν Θήβῃσι. τάδε δὲ ἤδη τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἤκουον Θερσάνδρου ἀνδρὸς μὲν Ὀρχομενίου, λογίμου δὲ ἐς τὰ πρῶτα

---

14 τοσοῦτον CP*z*: οὕτω R **16.** 2 μεγαλωστὶ malit van H. 4 ἕποντο *z* 5 τὰ δὲ δὲ δὴ R: τὰ δὲ ἤδη SV*z* 6, 7 'Ἐρχομενίου et Ἐρχομένῳ suadent tituli' van H.

---

16. 1. **ἐχόντων δὲ τὸν πόνον τ.**: i.e. while engaged on the labour of making the fortified camp.

Ἀτταγῖνος ὁ Φρύνωνος: of the father, Phrynon, nothing is recorded; the name was not very uncommon: at Athens it appears in the war with Mytilene for Sigeion in the days of Pittakos, cp. Plutarch, *de Hdti. Malig.* 15 = *Mor.* 858, cp. 5. 95 *supra.* Attaginos reappears in c. 86 *infra*, without patronymic, as one of the leading 'dynasts' of Thebes, whose extradition was demanded by the Hellenes after their victory. This observation supports the view that the present passage belongs to the original draft of the work; see lower down. According to Plutarch (*op. c.* 31) he was a *hospes* of Demaratos, and had by him been introduced to the king during the previous year: Δημάρατος ὁ Σπαρτιάτης διὰ ξενίαν εὔνους ὢν Ἀτταγίνῳ τῷ προεστῶτι τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας, διεπράξατο φίλον βασιλέως γενέσθαι καὶ ξένον. (The name is curious: from ἀτταγᾶς, a partridge; Aristoph. *Bds.* 247, 761; while φρύνη, φρῦνος, is a toad; cp. Φρύνιχος, Kuropatkin, etc.)

2. **μεγάλως**, *magno apparatu*; cp. 6. 70 (ὑποδέχεσθαι), 1. 167 (ἐναγίζειν) etc.

ἐκάλεε ἐπὶ ξείνια, 'invited (*or*, was inviting) to a banquet'; cp. 5. 18. **πεντήκοντα**: perhaps 'covers were laid' for 100 in all, or else for 102. **λογιμωτάτους**, cc. 24, 37 *infra*: λόγιμος c. 64 *infra.* **κληθέντες δὲ οὗτοι εἵποντο**: this specific record of the acceptance of the invitation is curious: is it matter of surprise that Persian grandees should accept the invitation of a Greek? Or was Theban cookery of ill repute? Athenaeus, p. 148 E, reconstructs the *menu*: θρία, καὶ ἑψητούς, καὶ ἀφύας, καὶ ἐγκρασικόλους, καὶ ἀλλᾶντας, καὶ σχελίδας καὶ ἔτνος—very paltry fare, and enough to account for the defeat of the Persians, ἀπολωλότες ἤδη ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων τροφῶν, but still luxury compared with the Λακωνικὸν δεῖπνον c. 82 *infra.*

4. **ἦν . . ποιεύμενον ἐν Θήβῃσι**: not in the Persian camp, cp. *infra*; the difference between ἦν ποιεύμενον and ἐποιέετο is rather fine.

5. **τάδε δὲ ἤδη τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἤκουον.** The 'banquet of Attaginos' was apparently celebrated, and a part of general tradition; Hdt. has, however, a particular anecdote to relate about it, which he owes to a special source of information—a source full of possibilities! Probably the general report in regard to the banquet was very different from the pessimism of this anecdote, which Hdt. had apparently heard not once, but again and again (ἤκουον, cp. ἤκουσα 7. 55).

6. **Θερσάνδρου . . Ὀρχομενίου.** Why does not Hdt. give a patronymic to this prince of Orchomenos? Thersandros occurs as the name of the son of Polyneikes 4. 147, 6. 52. The Orchomenos here named is of course the Boiotian; cp. 8. 34. (On the coinage the all but constant form of the name is Erchomenos; cp. Head, *H.N.* 294 and c. 28 *infra.*) Had this Orchomenian paid for his medism with exile? Had Hdt. as a boy heard the story from the exile's lips? Where or when had they met? Perhaps in Hdt.'s own Halikarnassian home. The Orchomenian will not have been quite a young man in 479 B.C., and there is not the slightest necessity to delay the intercourse between Thersandros and Hdt. until the latter's visit to Boiotia (of which we have conclusive evidence in 5. 59): the imperfect ἤκουον also militates

ἐν Ὀρχομενῷ. ἔφη δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος κληθῆναι καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ Ἀτταγίνου ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦτο, κληθῆναι δὲ καὶ Θηβαίων ἄνδρας πεντήκοντα, καί σφεων οὐ χωρὶς ἑκατέρους κλῖναι, ἀλλὰ Πέρσην τε καὶ Θηβαῖον ἐν κλίνῃ ἑκάστῃ. ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ δείπνου ἦσαν, διαπινόντων τὸν Πέρσην τὸν ὁμόκλινον Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἱέντα εἰρέσθαι αὐτὸν ὁκοδαπός ἐστι, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑποκρίνασθαι ὡς εἴη Ὀρχομένιος. τὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν "ἐπεὶ νῦν ὁμοτράπεζός τέ μοι καὶ ὁμόσπονδος ἐγένεο, μνημόσυνά τοι γνώμης τῆς ἐμῆς καταλιπέσθαι θέλω, ἵνα καὶ προειδὼς αὐτὸς περὶ σεωυτοῦ βουλεύεσθαι ἔχῃς τὰ συμφέροντα. ὁρᾷς τούτους τοὺς δαινυμένους Πέρσας καὶ τὸν στρατὸν τὸν ἐλίπομεν ἐπὶ

---

7 *κλιθῆναι* Reiske, van H.: *κλινῆναι* Dindorf   11 *ἔσαν* *z*   12 *ἰέντα* C*z* || *ποδαπός* **B**: ὁκοδαπός Bekker   13 *εἶπαι* *z*, van H. || *Ἐπεί νυν* van H.   14 *ἐγένετο* R || *τοι* : *τε* CS   15 *ἐθέλω* **B**   16 *ἑωυτοῦ* C   17 *τοὺς* om. A[1]C

---

against that. Thersandros is memorable as one of the three men whom Hdt. actually names among his informants (cp. 3. 55, 4. 76—the scribe at Sais is anonymous 2. 28). The pseudo-antithesis *ἀνδρὸς μὲν Ὀρχομενίου, λογίμου δὲ ἐν Ὀρχομενῷ* is curious; or, perhaps, in contrast to his position as an exile in Asia: otherwise it were a stylistic infelicity. Was the exile of Orchomenos reduced to keeping a school, like *Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ* (Cicero *ad A.* 9. 9. 1, *ad F.* 9. 18. 1)? Was he one of Hdt.'s tutors? His doctrine is thoroughly Herodotean!

τὰ πρῶτα: cp. c. 78 *infra*, 7. 134 *supra*; rather differently in 7. 13.

8. **Θηβαίων**. Rawlinson understands 'Boiotians' generally: there would be more Thebans perhaps than from any other city, but probably all the cities of the Boiotian Confederacy would be represented. Was the banquet rigidly confined to 'Boiotians' and 'Persians'? Were no Makedonians, no Medes, no Thessalians present?

9. **οὐ χωρὶς ἑκατέρους κλῖναι**. *Attaginus hospes* (*dicitur*) *κλῖναι*, cp. 1. 126 *τοὺς Πέρσας κατακλίνας ἐς λειμῶνα εὐώχεε. Quare haud opus scribere κλινῆναι* (Baehr). Cp. App. Crit. *ἑκατέρους*, each set, both sets, i.e. Greeks and 'barbarians.' A Greek couch held two, a Roman three persons. Attaginos evidently wished the 'Thebans' and 'Persians' to fraternize.

10. **ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ δείπνου ἦσαν**: when they were done eating; cp. *ἀπὸ δ. ἐγίνοντο* 6. 129, 5. 18. Thersandros and his companion seem to have preserved silence during the eating, and only thawed on the arrival of the wine: *διαπίνειν l.c. supra*. The 'Persian' could speak Greek *Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἱέντα*, cp. 1. 57.

12. **ὁποδαπός**: *qua ex terra, cuias*; 5. 13, 7. 218. The Orchomenian does not appear to have emulated the curiosity of his *ὁμόκλινος* (an *Hapaxlegomenon*). The idea is, perhaps, that the Persian would not have been so frank to a 'Theban' proper.

14. **ὁμοτράπεζος . . ὁμόσπονδος**: the one referring to eating, the other to libations; the tables had no doubt been taken away before the drinking began; *ὁμοτρ.* 3. 132.

ἐγένεο: a perfect might have been expected; but the aorist emphasizes the fact that they were **ἀπὸ δείπνου** and that the *σπονδαί* had taken place.

μνημόσυνα, 6. 109. The Persian speaker apparently treats his own death as a foregone conclusion, though he assumes that his boon-companion will survive (*ὄψεαι infra*); his *γνώμη* is to be found less in his prophecy than in his philosophy. The word **γνώμη** is used here in the more abstract sense, unusual with Hdt.

15. **ἵνα . . ἔχῃς**: Thersandros might have acted on this hint at once; perhaps afterwards he wished that he had done so. *ἔχειν* is here 'to be able.'

16. **ὁρᾷς . . τὸν ἐλίπομεν**: only possible to 'the mind's eye'; so that there is a kind of zeugma.

17. **δαινυμένους**, middle, 'to have a

τῷ ποταμῷ στρατοπεδευόμενον· τούτων πάντων ὄψεαι ὀλίγου τινὸς χρόνου διελθόντος ὀλίγους τινὰς τοὺς περιγενομένους." ταῦτα ἅμα τε τὸν Πέρσην λέγειν καὶ μετιέναι πολλὰ τῶν δακρύων. αὐτὸς δὲ θωμάσας τὸν λόγον εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν "οὐκῶν Μαρδονίῳ τε ταῦτα χρεόν ἐστι λέγειν καὶ τοῖσι μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἐν αἴνῃ ἐοῦσι Περσέων;" τὸν δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰπεῖν "ξεῖνε, ὅ τι δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀμήχανον ἀποτρέψαι ἀνθρώπῳ· οὐδὲ γὰρ πιστὰ λέγουσι ἐθέλει πείθεσθαι οὐδείς. ταῦτα δὲ Περσέων συχνοὶ ἐπιστάμενοι ἑπόμεθα ἀναγκαίῃ

---

18 ἐστρατοπεδευμένον malit van H. || τουτέων z   19 τοὺς del. Cobet, van H.   20 ταῦτά τε ἅμα **B**, Holder, van H. || πολλοὺς z   21 θωυμάσας Pz, Stein[1] || εἶπαι z, van H.   22 χρεών **B**Pz, van H. || μετὰ **a**   23 εἶπαι z, van H.   25 πείθεσθαι θέλει **B**

---

feast prepared for one'; cp. 1. 211; active, 1. 162—a poetic word.

18. **ὄψεαι . . ὀλίγους τινάς**, predicative, 'few will be the survivors thou shalt see.'

20. **ἅμα τε . . καί**: a strong parataxis.

μετιέναι πολλὰ τῶν δακρύων, *emittere*; cp. γλῶσσαν μετεὶς 6. 29 (elsewhere *demittere, dimittere, omittere, remittere*; cp. Schweig. *Lex.*) 'his tears were many'—though his words were few. This lachrymose gentleman is a faithful copy, or perhaps model, of the weeping despot at Abydos, 7. 46, but he combines in his own person the weeping of Xerxes with the wisdom of Artabanos! Thersander's instructions were not lost on Herodotus; this anecdote appears to be the nucleus of that more elaborate and rhetorical scene.

22. **οὐκῶν Μαρδονίῳ τε κτλ.** The astounding *naïveté* of this remark leads one to doubt whether Thersander, or Herodotus, has reported the conversation quite fully. Stein indeed suggests that the Persian must have known of the treacherous intrigues against Mardonios headed by Artabazos; cp. c. 66 *infra*: but are they proven?

τοῖσι μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἐν αἴνῃ ἐοῦσι Π. would include Artabazos *imprimis*, to whom it would be useless or dangerous to say much! ἐν αἴνῃ εἶναι 8. 112; Περσέων with τοῖσι.

24. **ὅ τι δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ κτλ.** This Persian not only speaks good Greek but has drunk deeply—at the wells of Greek wisdom. In a less pious expression the same fatalism appeals to Amasis as the moral of the story of Polykrates' Ring, 3. 43; in a still higher region it rules the gods themselves, as the Pythia informed Kroisos 1. 91 τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἀδύνατα ἐστὶ ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῷ. There is no such pessimistic quietism on the Achaimenid monuments, which breathe glad confidence in the patronage and providence of Ahura-mazda (τοῦ θεοῦ); but it must be admitted that Mazdeism sought to overcome its inherent dualism by tracing Good and Evil to a common Antecedent, Space, Time, Fate, or such-like. Such monism existed in the fourth century, if not in the fifth; though if Darmesteter be right, no direct trace of such a system is to be found in the *Avesta* (cp. *Sacred Bks. of the East*, IV. p. lxxxii.). But surely fatalism as a belief, or sentiment, the recognition of the unappeasable Power behind the benignant Person, is not the special product of any nation, or of any creed, but *allgemein menschlich*. It is less Hebraic than Hellenic, less Persian than Anglian. Boiotian Hesiod and Wessex Hardy are as deeply tinged therewith as Ecclesiastes or Omar Khayyam; and the Greek are here the older sources. Cp. 5. 4 with my notes *ad l.*

26. **ταῦτα δὲ Περσέων συχνοί κτλ.**: not so much the pious generalization, which has immediately preceded, as (*a*) the approaching destruction of the army, (*b*) the uselessness of addressing Mardonios and those in authority. This anecdote may perhaps be taken for evidence that a Persian victory was by no means regarded in the Persian camp as a foregone conclusion; many other hints point to the same inference: (1)

ἐνδεδεμένοι. ἐχθίστη δὲ ὀδύνη ἐστὶ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι αὕτη, πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατέειν.” ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ Ὀρχομενίου Θερσάνδρου ἤκουον, καὶ τάδε πρὸς τούτοισι, ὡς αὐτὸς αὐτίκα λέγοι ταῦτα πρὸς ἀνθρώπους πρότερον ἢ γενέσθαι ἐν Πλαταιῇσι τὴν μάχην.

Μαρδονίου δὲ ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίῃ στρατοπεδευομένου, οἱ μὲν **17**
ἄλλοι παρείχοντο ἅπαντες στρατιὴν καὶ συνεσέβαλον ἐς Ἀθήνας

---

27 *ἐστὶ* del. Holder : om. P : *ἔστιν* post *ἀνθρώποισιν* **B** 28 *κρατεῖν* C, van H. || *τοῦ ὀρχομενίου* **B**z, Holder, van H., Stein³ : *ὀρχομενίου* 29 *Θερσάνδρου* secl. van H., Holder 30 *ἀνθρώπους* : *ἄλλους* Valckenaer || *ἐν* om. R 31 *πλαταίῃισι* AB : *πλαταίῇσι* R 17. 1 *στρατευομένου* **B** : *ἐστρατοπεδευμένου* malit van H. 2 *συνέβαλον* C : *συνέβαλλον* PS : *συνεσέβαλλον* Pᵐ (*συνέβαλον* **B** ap. Holder) || *ἐς Ἀθήνας* secl. Krueger, van H.

---

the advice of the Thebans, c. 2 *supra*; (2) the repeated efforts of Mardonios to win over the Athenians, cp. c. 4 *supra*, 8. 136; (3) the probable tampering with the Peloponnesians, cp. cc. 12 f. *supra*; (4) the evacuation of Attica and the reasons therefor, c. 13 *supra*; (5) the formation of the fortified camp, c. 15 *supra*; (6) the other suggestions in this very anecdote; (7) these indications are reinforced later, cp. c. 42 *infra*.

ἀναγκαίῃ ἐνδεδεμένοι: cp. 1. 11 *ἀναγκαίῃ ἐνδέειν* of a choice—of evils! Cp. *ὑπ' ἀναγκαίης ἐχόμενοι* 7. 233, and c. 15 *supra*; (*κατεζευγμένοι*) 8. 22. The compulsion is ideal and in the present case would arise from (*a*) loyalty, (*b*) military discipline, (*c*) the double certitude of disaster in case of *στάσις*, (*d*) cowardice, or faintheartedness.

27. **ὀδύνη**: a poetical word for pain of body as well as of mind, and frequently in the plural. (Found also in Xenoph., Plato.)

τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι: sc. *ὀδυνῶν*, or, perhaps, more generally, 'in the wide world.'

28. **πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατέειν**, 'to have much wit and little weight'; cp. Sophokles *O.T.* 316 (Teiresia loq.) *φεῦ φεῦ φρονεῖν ὡς δεινὸν ἔνθα μὴ τέλη λύει φρονοῦντι.* The two passages are hardly independent. Sophokles owes something, perhaps, to Hdt. Cp. Baehr, *Commentatio* § 5 (iv.² 416 ff.). The poet, however, has a more genial word in store, *Antig.* 1347 *πολλῷ τὸ φρονεῖν εὐδαιμονίας πρῶτον ὑπάρχει κτλ.*, and also a useful *caveat* for any would-be Cassandra, *Aias* 1418 *ἦ πολλὰ βροτοῖς ἔστιν ἰδοῦσιν γνῶναι· πρὶν ἰδεῖν δ' οὐδεὶς μάντις τῶν μελλόντων ὅ τι πράξει.*

29. **ἤκουον**: as above. Orchomenian Thersander used to add that he (had) made no secret of the matter at the time, but mentioned it to several persons (*ἀνθρώπους*: his wife, perhaps, among others?) before the fulfilment of the Persian's dismal boding in the battle of Plataia. It is plain that Thersander, and Herodotus, were much concerned to refute criticism of this anecdote as a *vaticinium post eventum.* But were any of these persons ever produced as witnesses? How much of the anecdote as here related is Thersander's, and how much is due to the art and language of Hdt.? Or was the Orchomenian one of Hdt.'s mentors? Cp. 1. 6 *supra*.

30. **ἐν Πλαταιῇσι**: as the battle certainly did not take place in the city of Plataia, which had been destroyed (8. 50), and the site of which was at some distance from the actual battlefield, cc. 52 ff. *infra*, it is clear that *ἐν Πλαταιῇσι* here = *ἐν τῇ Πλαταιίδι*.

17. 1. **ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίῃ** = *ἐν τῇ Θηβαΐδι*, but here used probably from the reference to Attica on the one side and to Phokis on the other.

2. **καὶ συνεσέβαλον ἐς Ἀθήνας**: not content with taking all the 'Persian' forces into Attica (cp. 8. 50) Hdt. here takes about 50,000 Greek soldiers in also. Hdt.'s strategy is like some modern Political Economy; it assumes the infinite mobility of Labour (and Capital)! **τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων** excludes probably those in Peloponnesos, Asia, the islands, etc. The next sentence as

ὅσοι περ ἐμήδιζον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων, μοῦνοι δὲ Φωκέες οὐ συνεσέβαλον (ἐμήδιζον γὰρ δὴ σφόδρα καὶ οὗτοι) οὐκ ἑκόντες ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀναγκαίης, ἡμέρῃσι δὲ οὐ πολλῇσι μετὰ τὴν ἄπιξιν τὴν ἐς Θήβας ὕστερον ἦλθον αὐτῶν ὁπλῖται χίλιοι, ἦγε δὲ αὐτοὺς Ἁρμοκύδης ἀνὴρ τῶν ἀστῶν δοκιμώτατος. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπίκατο καὶ οὗτοι ἐς Θήβας, πέμψας ὁ Μαρδόνιος ἱππέας ἐκέλευσε σφέας ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ ἵζεσθαι. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐποίησαν ταῦτα, αὐτίκα παρῆν ἵππος ἡ ἅπασα. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα διεξῆλθε μὲν διὰ τοῦ στρατοπέδου

4 *συνέβαλον* S : *συνέβαλλον* Marc. : *συνεσέβαλλον* PR (*συνεσέβαλλον* **B** ap. Holder) || *γὰρ σφόδρα* **B**C : *γὰρ μεγάλως* z : *σφόδρα* del. Letronne, Holder : *γὰρ ἤδη σφόδρα*? Stein(2) 5 *οὐ* <*σφόδρα*> *ἑκόντες* Gomperz, Holder 6 *αὐτέων* **B**z 7 *δυνατώτατος* **a**C 8 *ἐπείτε*? van H. || *ἀπικέατο* Pz || *ἐς τὰς* **B** 9 *ἱππέας ὁ Μαρδόνιος ἐκέλευε* **B**, Holder || *ἱππέας* secl. Kallenberg, Holder || *ἀπ'* **B** 10 *ἐπεὶ* : *ὡς* **B**, Holder, van H. || *ἡ ἵππος ἅπασα* **B**, Holder, van H. 11 *ταῦτα* del. van H.

it stands is not clear; **σφόδρα** makes the difficulty; it would go better with the preceding *ἐμήδιζον*, or out altogether; Stein makes the sentence: *μοῦνοι δὲ Φωκέες οὐ συνεσέβαλον . . οὐκ ἑκόντες ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀναγκαίης*, perhaps intending the last five words to be taken with the first *καὶ συνεσέβαλον ἐς Ἀθήνας*—rather a remote reference. And would it have been true that the Thebans, for example, invaded Attica *οὐκ ἑκόντες*? (Yes, perhaps, in view of c. 2 *supra*.)

5. **ἡμέρῃσι δὲ οὐ πολλῇσι.** Hdt.'s conventionalized journal of Plataia has not yet begun; if the arrival of the Phokians at the Persian camp preceded the arrival of the Hellenes at Erythrai (c. 19 *infra*) the Greeks were rather slow in crossing Kithairon.

6. **τὴν ἄπιξιν τὴν ἐς Θήβας**: not the visit to Thebes for the banquet of Attaginos, c. 16 *supra*, but the arrival of the forces out of Attica at the Laager, c. 15 *supra*. The name of the city is put for the name of the country, as *ἐς Ἀθήνας* just above; cp. *ἐν Πλαταιῇσι* c. 16 *supra*.

7. **χίλιοι**: the same number had served in the army of Leonidas 7. 203, 212, 217 f., and no doubt very much the same men. The anecdote here has the 'tendency,' the intention, to whitewash the Phokian Chiliad, whose reputation had been somewhat blasted by the Spartan (Peloponnesian) story of Thermopylai.

Ἁρμοκύδης: the name appears to be unique; no patronymic is given; the leader's name at Thermopylai is suppressed.

It is not easy to establish much difference between **δοκιμώτατος** (*δέχομαι*) and *λόγιμος ἐς τὰ πρῶτα* or *λογιμώτατος* (c. 16), but perhaps *δόκιμος* is less obviously relative also to posterity.

8. **ἀπίκατο . . ἐς Θήβας**, pl.p., 'were come' = *ἦσαν ἀπιγμένοι*. *ἐς Θ.* = *ἐς τὴν Θηβαΐδα*: cp. above.

9. **ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ ἵζεσθαι**: the active *ἵζειν* is used of the act of sitting, literally understood, 5. 25, 6. 57—so is the middle, 5. 18—which is, however, constantly used of this military operation, 8. 71, c. 2 *supra*, c. 26 *infra*, etc.

ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν, 'by themselves,' separately; cp. c. 38 *supra*. This use of **ἐπί** is primarily locative, as *ἐπὶ τῆς γωνίης*, 1. 51, 'in the corner'; cp. 8. 32 *ἡ κορυφὴ κατὰ Νέωνα πόλιν ἐπ' ἑωυτῆς*—differing from the temporal force in *ἐπ' ἐμεῦ*, *ἐπὶ Ξανθίππου*, etc.; 'on the plain' need not be taken to imply that any part of the forces, or the camp, was on the mountain, it merely prepares the way for the ensuing cavalry development.

10. **αὐτίκα παρῆν ἵππος ἡ ἅπασα**: the exact number of chiliads, or myriads, would here be acceptable; but the phrase will in any case be an over-statement—unless, indeed, there were far fewer of the cavalry than Hdt. seems throughout to assume.

11. **διεξῆλθε μὲν . . φήμη**: there seems to be nothing supernormal in this

τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ τοῦ μετὰ Μήδων ἐόντος φήμη ὡς κατακοντιεῖ σφεας, διεξῆλθε δὲ δι' αὐτῶν Φωκέων τὠυτὸ τοῦτο. ἔνθα δή σφι ὁ στρατηγὸς Ἁρμοκύδης παραίνεε λέγων τοιάδε. "ὦ Φωκέες, πρόδηλα γὰρ ὅτι ἡμέας οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι μέλλουσι προόπτῳ θανάτῳ δώσειν, διαβεβλημένους ὑπὸ Θεσσαλῶν, ὡς ἐγὼ εἰκάζω· νῦν ἄνδρα πάντα τινὰ ὑμέων χρεόν ἐστι γενέσθαι ἀγαθόν· κρέσσον γὰρ ποιεῦντάς τι καὶ ἀμυνομένους τελευτῆσαι τὸν αἰῶνα ἢ περ παρέχοντας διαφθαρῆναι αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ. ἀλλὰ μαθέτω τις αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐόντες βάρβαροι ἐπ' Ἕλλησι ἀνδράσι φόνον ἔρραψαν." ὁ μὲν ταῦτα παραίνεε· οἱ δὲ **18**
ἱππέες ἐπεί σφεας ἐκυκλώσαντο, ἐπήλαυνον ὡς ἀπολέοντες, καὶ δὴ διετείνοντο τὰ βέλεα ὡς ἀπήσοντες, καί κού τις καὶ

---

12 Μήδου S 13 *σφεας* ABz : *σφέας* || *αὐτέων* z || *Φωκέων* om. S || *ταυτὸ τοῦτο* C || *δέ* S 14 *Ἁρμοκύδης* del. van H. || *τάδε* B 16 *προδώσειν* Suidas s.v. *πρόοπτος* 17 *νῦν ὦν* **β**, Holder || *ἄνδρα πάντα τινὰ* **α** : *πάντά τινα ἄνδρα* **β**, (Holder) : *ἄνδρα τινὰ πάντα* CPz : *ἄνδρα* post *ἐστι* transpos. Cobet, van H. || *χρέων* CPz, van H. || *γίνεσθαι* **β** 20 *αὐτέων* z **18.** 1 *μὲν* <*ὦν*> H. Stephanus, van H. 2 *ἐπείτε* Holder, van H. : *ἐπεί τέ* **β** || *ἀπολεῦντες* **β** 3 *δή* : *δὴ καὶ* B : om. C || *ἀφήσοντες* **α**C

φήμη (cp. c. 100 *infra*), even when it, or one to exactly the same effect, passes right through the Phokians themselves.

στρατοπέδου here apparently = *στρατοῦ* or *στρατιῆς*. Cp. c. 51 *infra* etc.

12. **μετὰ Μήδων.** This story (*τὰ περὶ Φωκέων*), which is in the nature of a *Rettung*, will hardly have come from a Peloponnesian or from a 'medized' source. It might be of Phokian or of Attic origin. Hdt., who distinguishes Medes and Persians from the first, will probably have taken over the phraseology of his source.

κατακοντιεῖ (*κατακοντίζειν*) : sc. *ἡ ἵππος*. The weapon is noticeable, and implies close proximity.

13. **τὠυτὸ τοῦτο** : sc. *ὡς κ. σφεας*. Baehr cps. Thuc. 8. 108. 4 for the story of the fate of the Delian exiles in Atramyttion, who were treacherously surrounded and shot down at their morning meal by Arsakes the Persian, Sept. 411 B.C. (So too Stein.)

15. **πρόδηλα** : this pl. is a favourite construction with Hdt. ; cp. 1. 91 *ἀδύνατα*, 3. 35 *δῆλα*, 3. 109 *βιώσιμα*, etc. Kuehner, *Ausf. Gramm.* § 366, explains it as derived from the use of the abstract pl. demonstrative *ταῦτα*, *τάδε* etc. to denote one idea, or thing.

ἄνθρωποι, of course contemptuous (cp. 7. 210) and making **ἄνδρα** just below more significant.

16. **διαβεβλημένους ὑπὸ Θεσσαλῶν** : cp. 8. 27–31, for the Thessalo-Phokian feud.

17. **πάντα τινά** with the second person, Kuehner *op. c.* § 371. 4 γ. The subject is indefinite, yet conceived as present, and capable of being addressed directly.

18. **κρέσσον γάρ κτλ.** It is a pity these worthy sentiments had not inspired the Phokians on the mount above Thermopylai ; cp. 7. 218. But that was another (a Peloponnesian) story !

19. **τὸν αἰῶνα**, 'life' ; cp. 7. 46.

παρέχοντας, 'without opposition,' like our 'yield.' There is perhaps an ellipse (*ἑαυτούς*) ; cp. L. & S. *sub v.* II. 2 and passages there quoted, which show (as Stein observes) that the word is used of submitting to medical examination, surgical operations, etc. (Xenophon, Plato).

20. **ἐπ' Ἕλλησι ἀνδράσι** : Ἕλλην adj. (*φόνον*) **ῥάπτειν** is poetic ; not as in 6. 1. Cp. *Od.* 16. 379 *φόνον αἰπὺν ἐράπτομεν*. But the metaphor here is rather pointless, unless it were referred to the *διαβολή* of the Thessalians, whom the Phokian could not mean to describe as *βάρβαροι*.

18. 3. **καὶ δὴ διετείνοντο τὰ βέλεα ὡς**

ἀπῆκε. καὶ οἳ ἀντίοι ἕστασαν πάντῃ συστρέψαντες ἑωυτοὺς καὶ πυκνώσαντες ὡς μάλιστα. ἐνθαῦτα οἱ ἱππόται ὑπέστρεφον καὶ ἀπήλαυνον ὀπίσω. οὐκ ἔχω δ' ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν οὔτε εἰ ἦλθον μὲν ἀπολέοντες τοὺς Φωκέας δεηθέντων Θεσσαλῶν, ἐπεὶ δὲ ὥρων πρὸς ἀλέξησιν τραπομένους, δείσαντες μὴ καὶ σφίσι γένηται τρώματα, οὕτω δὴ ἀπήλαυνον ὀπίσω· ὧς γάρ σφι ἐνετείλατο Μαρδόνιος· οὔτ' εἰ αὐτῶν πειρηθῆναι ἠθέλησε εἴ τι ἀλκῆς μετέχουσι. ὡς δὲ ὀπίσω ἀπήλασαν οἱ ἱππόται, πέμψας Μαρδόνιος κήρυκα ἔλεγε τάδε. "θαρσέετε ὦ Φωκέες· ἄνδρες γὰρ ἐφάνητε ἐόντες ἀγαθοί, οὐκ ὡς ἐγὼ ἐπυνθανόμην. καὶ νῦν προθύμως φέρετε τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον· εὐεργεσίῃσι γὰρ οὐ νικήσετε οὔτ' ὦν ἐμὲ οὔτε βασιλέα." τὰ περὶ Φωκέων μὲν ἐς τοσοῦτο ἐγένετο.

19 *Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ὡς ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἦλθον, ἐν τούτῳ*

---

4 *ἀφῆκε* **a**C : *ἀπήκετο* z || *καὶ οἳ* Az : *καὶ οἱ* BCP(SV) : *καὶ* R || *ἕστασαν* Pz, van H., Stein[3] : *ἔστασαν* C, Marc. : *ἔστησαν* || *πάντες* S || *στρέψαντες* **a**C 5 *κυκλώσαντες* **B** 6 *δὲ* **B** || *εἶπαι* z, van H. 7 *εἰ* om. CR 8 *ἑώρων* **a**C 9 *τρῶμα* Naber || *ὡς* ABC : *ὃς* R 10 *οὔτε* **B** || *αὐτέων* z 11 *ἔχουσι* duo Paris. prob. Valckenaer 15 *οὔτε ἐμὲ οὔτε βασιλῆα* z 16 *τοσοῦτον* **B**z

---

ἀπ. : *καὶ ἤδη δ. τὰ τόξα ὡς ἀπήσοντες τὰ βέλεα* would be more correct.

4. **πάντῃ συστρέψαντες ἑωυτούς** : cp. Livy 8. 11. 5 *cum se in unum conglobassent* (Valckenaer). But the tactical manœuvre here described is really at closer quarters; just as 1. 101 *Δηιόκης τὸ Μηδικὸν ἔθνος συνέστρεψε* is on a larger scale. Cp. *συστροφή* 7. 9, *συστραφέντες* 6. 6. **ὑποστρέφειν** just below gives a different result; cp. *ὑποστροφή* c. 22 *infra*.

6. **οὐκ ἔχω δ' ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν.** Hdt. thinks that if the intention really was to destroy the Phokians, it must have been dictated by the Thessalians; and this view is evidently a datum of his source or authority; but he himself suggests another alternative, viz. that Mardonios merely meant to put their mettle to the proof (**ἀλκή**, cp. cc. 70, 102 *infra*). A third alternative he does not face, viz. that the whole story was an exaggeration, or even based upon a misunderstanding, of what was intended for a complimentary reception!

7. **οὔτε** is, of course, the idiomatic doubling of the negative, after *οὐκ ἔχω*.

εἰ ἦλθον . . εἰ ἠθέλησε . . : the two alternatives put as strict co-ordinates.

8. **πρὸς ἀλέξησιν τραπομένους** : cp. *πρὸς ἀλκὴν τραπέσθαι* c. 102 *infra* and Hesych. *sub v.* *ἀλκή· δύναμις ἰσχὺς ἢ ἀλέξησις ἢ μάχη*. The word is an *ἅπαξ λ.* in Hdt., and Schweighaeuser overlooked this passage in his *Lexicon*.

9. **ὥς = οὕτω**, as often with *δὲ καί* but only here with *γάρ* (Krueger).

13. **ἐπυνθανόμην** : of course from the Thessalians.

14. **π. φέρετε**: cp. c. 40 *infra*: like the Thebans.

15. **ὦν** emphasizes his own case.

16. **ἐς τοσοῦτο ἐγ.**, 'went no further.'

19. 1. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δέ : if *τὰ περὶ Φωκέων*, cc. 17, 18, should be judged an addition, second hand (cp. Introduction, § 9), these words would correspond with *ταῦτα μὲν Ὀρχομενίου κτλ.* at the end of c. 16. The exact point of time at which 'the Lakedaimonians' reached the Isthmos has not been previously indicated. The 5000 'Spartiates' have started in c. 10, followed by 5000 *Perioikoi* in c. 11; these forces are under way in c. 12; but the Spartiatai have not reached the Isthmos in c. 13 when Mardonios decided and began to evacuate Attica (*πρὶν ἢ τοὺς μετὰ Παυσανίεω ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἐσβαλεῖν*). The arrival of 1000 'Lakedaimonians,' apparently an advanced guard, at Megara is recorded

ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο. πυνθανόμενοι δὲ ταῦτα οἱ λοιποὶ Πελοποννήσιοι τοῖσι τὰ ἀμείνω ἑάνδανε, οἳ δὲ καὶ ὁρῶντες ἐξιόντας Σπαρτιήτας, οὐκ ἐδικαίευν λείπεσθαι τῆς ἐξόδου [Λακεδαιμονίων]. ἐκ δὴ ὦν τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ καλλιερησάντων [τῶν ἱρῶν] ἐπορεύοντο πάντες καὶ ἀπικνέονται ἐς Ἐλευσῖνα· ποιήσαντες δὲ καὶ ἐνθαῦτα ἱρά, ὥς σφι ἐκαλλιέρεε, τὸ πρόσω ἐπορεύοντο,

---

19. 2 λοιποὶ om. S 3 ὁρέοντες CPz, Stein[1], van H. 4 ἐδικαίουν van H. || nomen secl. Stein 5 τῶν ἱρῶν secl. Krueger, Stein[2], Holder, van H. 7 ἐκαλλιέρεε, τὸ Suevern: ἐκαλλιρέετο, R: ἐκαλλιερέετο || ἐπορεύετο R

---

in c. 14, and Mardonios is apparently still in Attica; in c. 15 intelligence reaches Mardonios that *ἁλέες εἴησαν οἱ Ελληνες ἐν τῷ Ἰσθμῷ*. Only then does he finally clear out of Attica. *οἱ Ἕλληνες* there covers more than *Λακεδαιμόνιοι* here (esp. *ἁλέες*), and anticipates the junction of *οἱ λοιποὶ Πελοποννήσιοι τοῖσι τὰ ἀμείνω ἑάνδανε* with the Lakedaimonians, which is recorded here immediately below. The position of the *πρόδρομος στρατιή*, *Λακεδαιμονίων χίλιοι* (c. 14) at Megara is a little obscure; but there is a moment apparently before Mardonios has evacuated Attica when 1000 Lakedaimonians are in Megara, and some 9000–10,000 at the Isthmos, or on the way thither, to say nothing of the Helots. At the Isthmos they are joined by the rest of the confederate forces from Peloponnese, but only after Mardonios has heard of this mobilization and concentration does he evacuate Attica; and only after he has evacuated Attica do the confederate forces advance to Eleusis. It is just conceivable that the arrival of the *πρόδρομος στρατιή* in Megara is not quite correctly chronologized in c. 14, and that it was not separated by so large an interval as is there implied from the advance of the confederate forces from the Isthmos to Eleusis. Probably the last of the Persian cavalry had ridden down the northern slopes of Kithairon, and the construction of the camp on the Asopos was reported at Eleusis, before the sacrifices proved favourable to an advance into Boiotia.

3. **τοῖσι τὰ ἀμείνω ἑάνδανε**, 'which were (being) pleased with the better'—part, or policy? Is it the same as *οἱ τὰ ἀμείνω φρονέοντες* (cp. 7. 145)? Cp. 8. 29. The ones unrepresented were Argives, and some of the Achaian and Arkadian towns; with the exception of the Lepreatai all the states enumerated below, c. 28, had sent men to Thermopylai and Salamis (7. 202, 8. 1, 43).

οἳ δὲ καὶ ὁρῶντες ἐξ. Σπ. seems to be a qualification of the immediately preceding, 'but only when they saw'—or even perhaps but 'some of them only when they saw . .' Others may have been at the Isthmos before, or all along. The 'seeing' is not perhaps to be taken quite literally; cp. c. 16 *supra*.

4. **ἐδικαίευν**: cp. 8. 126.

λείπεσθαι, to miss, remain behind; cp. 7. 168, 8. 44, 113.

5. **καλλιερησάντων**: for the constr. cp. 7. 134. In the previous year the sacrifices had proved unfavourable, cp. c. 10 *supra*, and the Peloponnesians had not advanced beyond their wall. Even now, they are only favourable when Mardonios is already out of reach, or clearly not remaining in Attica; or at least not in occupation of the Thriasian plain.

7. **ὥς σφι ἐκαλλιέρεε**: why was there a fresh sacrifice? There was a fresh frontier to be crossed. Even if the sacrifice at the Isthmos might have carried the Peloponnesians to Erythrai (no express sacrifice is recorded in the Megarid, but there may have been one) there were the Athenians to be considered. Had Mardonios remained about Athens there could have been no fresh *διαβατήρια*, but no doubt there would have been daily *θυσίαι ἐπὶ τῷ Πέρσῃ* until the opportune moment arrived for forward action; cp. cc. 33, 36, 61 f. *infra*.

Is it at all likely that the Peloponnesians expected to find the Persians on the Thriasian plain (as Stein suggests)? The Athenians in Salamis, to say nothing of their own *πρόδρομοι* and *ἡμεροσκόποι*, will have kept them better informed than that. It appears, on the contrary,

Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἅμα αὐτοῖσι, διαβάντες μὲν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος, συμμιγέντες δὲ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι. ὡς δὲ ἄρα ἀπίκοντο τῆς Βοιωτίης ἐς Ἐρυθράς, ἔμαθόν τε δὴ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ στρατοπεδευομένους, φρασθέντες δὲ τοῦτο ἀντετάσ-

11 ἐστρατοπεδευμένους expectaret van H. || δὲ: τε Schaefer, van H.

obvious that the sacrifices became favourable to an advance only when the road was known to be clear.

9. **ὡς δὲ ἄρα ἀπίκοντο τῆς Βοιωτίης ἐς Ἐρυθράς**: there was something a little surprising in this movement, which certainly marks a new departure in the action (*ἄρα*); nothing like it has been attempted on land since the fiasco at Thermopylai; and the Persians might have been holding the pass. No doubt the junction with the Athenians is the decisive factor, and the Athenians are the driving force, in the advance into Boiotia. The advance to Eleusis was not definitely what the move into Boiotia is, a resumption of the offensive: perhaps at the same time the fleet leaves Salamis for Aigina, or Aigina for Delos, not to say Delos for Ionia.

Erythrai has been given, c. 15 *supra*, as the *terminus a quo* for the construction or measurement of the Persian *στρατόπεδον*. If the Persians were really at Erythrai, the Greeks could not have arrived there without first clearing the Persians out: that would have entailed a fight. Stein says there must here be a gap in Hdt.'s narrative. The Hellenes must have forced the pass of Eleutherai, and driven the enemy eastward on to the fortified camp at Skolos, and north, into the plain. But is that convincing? The forcing of the pass of Eleutherai-Erythrai, i.e. Dryoskephalai, would have been a colossal affair; imagine its having made not the faintest impression upon the traditions of the Persian war! The holding of the pass would not have been good strategy on Mardonios' part, nor in accord with his general plan, as given in c. 13 *supra*. Moreover, as above shown, the fortified camp was not at Skolos, and had it been so, the sight presented to the Greeks, when they took up their quarters at Erythrai, would not have been that described in this chapter. Finally, Erythrai was not included in the Persian lines, cp. notes to c. 15 above.

The position of Erythrai has been determined by G. B. Grundy against Leake, cp. *The Great Persian War* (1901) pp. 458 ff. It is on the higher ground, above *Kriekouki*, in the gorge through which issued the direct road from Eleutherai to Thebes: *ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος*. The exact site of the town matters little, as the name is here doubtless used for the *χώρα*, cp. c. 17 *supra*.

10. **ἔμαθον . . τοὺς β. ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ στ.**: the whole army would, on arriving at Erythrai, and taking up its position in the *Erythraiis*, see the Persian encampment below; but of course the generals at least knew what to expect before they sighted it. The building of a huge fortified camp, and the settlement of the Persian lines in front of the Erythraian, Hysian, and (in part) Plataian *ὑπωρέη*, were doubtless reported at Eleusis before the Greek army advanced up the pass. *ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσώπῳ* would be an appropriate expression whether the camp was all in front of the river, or all behind the river, or partly on one side and partly on the other. The third alternative is to be preferred, but not to the extent of putting the *τεῖχος* far away to the east, on the S. side of the river, at Skolos. The object of Mardonios was to bring the Greeks down on to the lower ground, and even to draw them across the river; but in the first instance at least he would probably retain at least the *tête du pont* on the Erythraian side of the bridge.

Stein's text gives an anakoluthon *ἔμαθόν τε δὴ . . φρασθέντες δέ κτλ.* which he defends as an Herodoteanism, referring to 1. 108 *οὔτε . . παρεῖδες . . φυλασσόμεθα δέ* (instead of *τε*). 153 *ἐπ' οὓς ἐπεῖχέ τε στρατηλατέειν αὐτός, ἐπὶ δὲ Ἴωνας ἄλλον πέμπειν στρατηγόν.* 2. 126 *τὴν δὲ τά τε . . πρήσσεσθαι ἰδίῃ δὲ κτλ.* 3. 38 *πολλοῖσί τε . . ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῷδε.* 4. 76 *μήτε τεων ἄλλων Ἑλληνικοῖσι δὲ καὶ ἥκιστα.* 8. 142 *οὔτε γε ἀλλοῖσι . . ὑμῖν δὲ δὴ καὶ διὰ πάντων ἥκιστα.*

σοντο ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος. *Μαρδόνιος δέ, ὡς οὐ* **20**
κατέβαινον οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐς τὸ πεδίον, πέμπει ἐς αὐτοὺς πᾶσαν τὴν ἵππον, τῆς ἱππάρχεε Μασίστιος εὐδοκιμέων παρὰ Πέρσῃσι,

12 *ὑπωρείης* codd. *z* **20.** 2 *ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς* Marc. *z* 3 *ἵππαρχε* R

12. **Κιθαιρῶνος**: the mighty mountain chain which divides Attica from Boiotia, Parnes being but an eastward extension, while a southern ridge (*Ὄνεια*), terminating in the *Κέρατα*, divided Attica from Megaris; cp. 7. 141 *supra* and Strabo 380 (the view from the Akrokorinthos), 393 (the *Ὄνεια*), 405 (the western end, above the Krisaian gulf, and the continuity of Kithairon, the Megaric and the Attic mountains), 408–9 (the relation of Kithairon to the Asopos and the Parasopia), 411 (Plataia). But after all the identity of Kithairon is sufficiently attested by this very Book.

Hdt. takes the Greek forces over Kithairon in this chapter rather easily. No doubt the main body will have marched by the Eleutherai road; but some may have found their way over by the pass from Megara, cp. c. 13 *supra*, or even by the Aigosthena route; cp. *ibid.* The Hellenes are now in 'the first position,' or busily engaged in getting into it (**ἀντετάσσοντο ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος**); but in what order they deploy thereinto, by what manœuvres the various contingents take up their stations, what their line of battle, or of encampment, opposite the Persian, Hdt. does not describe, or indicate; but presently the Megarians are exposed to the brunt of the cavalry attack: they were therefore perhaps athwart the main road. In the absence of further positive indications we must either (i.) carry back the line of battle, described below for 'the second position,' and make it hold good for the first also; or else (ii.) post the Megarians simply at the head of the marching column, with the Athenians immediately behind them, so naturally coming to their support, while the Peloponnesians bring up the rear of the *agmen.* Cp. Appendix VIII. § 7.

20. 1. **ὡς οὐ κατέβαινον οἱ Ἕλ. ἐς τὸ πεδίον.** Mardonios wished to induce the Greeks to come down from the higher ground about or above Erythrai, and Hysiai, on to the lower ground nearer the Asopos. Later on they did so, with disastrous results to themselves in the first instance.

2. **πᾶσαν τὴν ἵππον τῆς ἱππάρχεε Μ.**, 'all the cavalry commanded by Masistios' is not of necessity all the cavalry in Laager, nor necessarily identical with *ἵππος ἡ ἅπασα* of c. 17 *supra.* But it is arguable that Masistios was in fact supreme Hipparch in the *corps d'armée* of Mardonios, and commanded a myriad of mounted men. In the army of Xerxes there had been three 'hipparchs' (one for each *corps d'armée*? cp. 7. 88), of whom Masistios was certainly not one. Had the cavalry now on service in Greece under Mardonios been cut down to one-third, and a new hipparch appointed? Or is he one hipparch of two, or three, in the whole forces of Mardonios? Cp. c. 69 *infra.*

3. **Μασίστιος . . τὸν Ἕλληνες Μακίστιον καλέουσι.** What Hellenes are these? Stein answers, Greek authors, writers; cp. 1. 7, 216, 2. 16. The sentence, unless athetized as a gloss, is good evidence that Hdt. had some written authorities before him for the history he is writing. But these authors are hardly poets, Simonides, (still less) Choirilos, as Stein suggests, but probably prose writers, such as Dionysios of Miletos, and possibly others; cp. Introduction, § 10.

A *Μασίστιος ὁ Σιρομίτρεω* appears 7. 79 as *ἄρχων* of the *Ἀλαρόδιοι* and *Σάσπειρες.* He may be the same man on promotion; but Hdt. is evidently unconscious of any such identity. This was a clear case for a patronymic, but none is forthcoming. Why did Greek authors call him Makistios if his name was Masistios? Was it to distinguish him from the son of Siromitres? Or was it to guard against that very confusion of *Μασίστιος* with *Μασίστης*, the full brother of Xerxes and one of the six chief Strategoi, 7. 82 (cp. c. 107 *infra*), into which Tzetzes actually fell; cp. Wesseling *ad l.* Or were the Greek authors perhaps right? Oddly enough *Μακίστιος* was an Eleian *ἐθνικόν* (cp. *Μάκιστον* 4. 148), and this Masistios was *μάκιστος* (as they might say in Elis, and elsewhere, for *μήκιστος*); his corpse even *ἦν θέης ἄξιος μεγάθεος εἵνεκα* c. 25 *infra.*

τὸν Ἕλληνες Μακίστιον καλέουσι, ἵππον ἔχων Νησαῖον χρυσοχάλινον καὶ ἄλλως κεκοσμημένον καλῶς. ἐνθαῦτα ὡς προσήλασαν οἱ ἱππόται πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, προσέβαλλον κατὰ τέλεα, προσβάλλοντες δὲ κακὰ μεγάλα ἐργάζοντο καὶ
21 γυναῖκας σφέας ἀπεκάλεον. κατὰ συντυχίην δὲ Μεγαρέες

4 Μακίσιον z || νισαῖον Marc. 5 καὶ cum τε supersc. P : τε καὶ **B**z, Holder, van H. 6 τοὺς om. C || προσέβαλον **B**P 7 προσβάλλοντες V : προσβαλόντες

4. **ἵππον ἔχων Νησαῖον**: riding—having under him—a Nesaian horse; cp. 7. 40.

5. **ἄλλως**, even apart from the gold bridle; in fact, 'in all respects.'

6. **προσήλασαν . . προσέβαλλον**: two distinct manœuvres are indicated. The whole cavalry under Masistios—perhaps a myriad, nominal—advanced together, and then (having halted) delivered a succession of charges *κατὰ τέλεα*, squadron by squadron, perhaps chiliads, nominal; cp. c. 22 *infra*. These attacks inflicted considerable damage upon the Greek ranks. An *ἱππομαχία* is quite *en règle* as a preliminary to hoplite or infantry engagements; cp. c. 49 *infra*, and 1. 80 (Sardes 547 B.C.), 5. 63 (Phaleron 512 B.C.), Xenoph. *Hell.* 3. 4. 22 ff. (Paktolos 395 B.C.), 6. 4. 10 ff. (Leuktra 371 B.C.), Arrian, *Anab.* 1. 14. 5 ff. (Granikos, 334 B.C.), etc. But at Plataia in 479 B.C. the Greeks had no cavalry, and therefore the fighting was not a true *ἱππομαχία*.

8. **γυναῖκας σφέας ἀπεκάλεον**: they added insult to injury by calling them 'women,' cowards! (for not coming down into the plain); this was the poisoned arrow in a Persian's quiver! cp. c. 107 *infra*. Had these riders learnt to speak Greek? or just picked up the word wanted? Or did they speak their own language? *ἀποκαλέειν* 3. 53, 'to recall'; here 'to reproach'; cp. Plato *Gorg.* 512 C, Aristot. *Eth. N.* 9. 8. 1 = 1168 b 30, but without dyslogism; ib. 2. 9. 7 = 1109 b 18.

21. 1. **κατὰ συντυχίην δὲ Μεγαρέες.** Hdt. apparently treats the Megarians as occupying a post in line with the rest of the forces, which by this time, according to him, are perhaps drawn up, or drawing up, along the *ὑπωρέη* of Kithairon; but he is not explicit upon the point, and gives no account of the respective positions of the various contingents. **ἀντετάσσοντο** above may well be an imperfect of the veriest type ('were falling into line,' or 'were taking up positions'). Hdt. first describes the line formation of the Greeks for the second position below, when there is even a dispute over a question of precedence, which must have been settled for the first position, if in the first position the Greeks were in line formation. I therefore suggest that in this first position the Greeks were still in column, emerging down the pass, headed by the Megarians (and Athenians?), who were to hold Erythrai and the roadway, which it commanded, while the remainder of the forces deployed from behind them only or mainly to the left, so as to take up positions *ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος*, the Spartans to the right (but cp. l. 12 *infra*), the Athenians to the left, towards Hysiai and Plataia. This development may or may not have been finally accomplished; meanwhile Mardonios attacks the head of the column as it emerges from the pass. (Perhaps, if the Athenians headed the column, they had already deployed on to the ground to the left.) He seems to have struck a little too soon, though not, perhaps, until convinced that the Greeks were not coming down into the plain. How it happened that 'the Megarians,' 3000 strong, were at the head of the column, if that was their position, who can say? Possibly the Lakedaimonian *χίλιοι* (c. 14 *supra*) were still with them, though the strongly 'atticizing' tradition forgets them; they may have headed the column from Megara to Eleusis, and so onwards; or they may even have come across Kithairon by the direct route from Megara, and so arrived at the head of the forces, while the Athenians may have led the column from Eleusis by Eleutherai. Of course there was no accident in the matter; all had been arranged.

ἔτυχον ταχθέντες τῇ τε ἐπιμαχώτατον ἦν τοῦ χωρίου παντός, καὶ πρόσοδος μάλιστα ταύτῃ ἐγίνετο τῇ ἵππῳ. προσβαλλούσης ὦν τῆς ἵππου οἱ Μεγαρέες πιεζόμενοι ἔπεμπον ἐπὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων κήρυκα, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ὁ κῆρυξ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔλεγε τάδε. "Μεγαρέες λέγουσι· ἡμεῖς, ἄνδρες σύμμαχοι, οὐ δυνατοί εἰμεν τὴν Περσέων ἵππον δέκεσθαι μοῦνοι, ἔχοντες στάσιν ταύτην ἐς τὴν ἕστημεν ἀρχήν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς τόδε λιπαρίῃ τε καὶ ἀρετῇ ἀντέχομεν καί περ πιεζόμενοι. νῦν τε εἰ μή τινας ἄλλους πέμψετε διαδόχους τῆς τάξιος, ἴστε ἡμέας ἐκλείψοντας τὴν τάξιν." ὃ μὲν δή σφι ταῦτα ἀπήγγελλε, Παυσανίης δὲ ἀπεπειρᾶτο τῶν Ἑλλήνων

---

21. 2 *τῇ τε* Bekker : *ᾗ τε* **β** : *ἧι τὸ* **α**CPz 3 *καὶ ἡ* **β** || *προσβαλλούσης* **α** : *προσβαλούσης* 6 *τάδε.* <*ὧδε*>*Μεγαρέες* Schenkl, Holder : *ἔλεγε· Τάδε* vel *ἔλεγε τάδε. Τάδε*? van H. 8 *στάσιν* : aut *τάξιν* scribend. aut *ἐς* versu sq. delend. censet van H. || *ἐς τὴν* : *ἐπ' ἣν* **β** 9 *ἀντέσχομεν* Naber 10 *πιεζεύμενοι* **β** || *διαδόχους πέμψητε* **β** 11 *τῆς τάξιος* del. van H. 12 *ἀπήγγειλε* Cz : *ἀπήγγελε* V, Marc.

---

2. **τῇ τε ἐπιμαχώτατον . . τῇ ἵππῳ.** This description would apply to the roadway running up the pass; of course, even so, the position, *τὸ χωρίον*, was not as much exposed as 'the second position,' c. 25 *infra*, and the cavalry could not attack *en masse*, but only on a narrow front, *κατὰ τέλεα* : *ἐπίμαχος*, cp. 1. 84, 6. 133 (in both places of fortifications, liable to assault); *πρόσοδος*, as in 7. 212, 223.

5. **τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων.** Where were they? and were they all together in one place? Are only Pausanias and Euryanax (c. 10 *supra*) covered by the term? Below, as the result of the message, Pausanias appears in sole authority. The message seems to imply a standpoint for the Strategoi, or Strategos, at some distance, and hardly in sight of the situation, which could hardly have been the case if the Greek lines had been already deployed *ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπωρέης*. The Megarian message was carried back up the pass; they call for support and relief. *μοῦνοι* denies the presence of any other contingent (so the Athenians ignored the presence of the Plataians at Marathon c. 27 *infra*). **ἔχοντες στάσιν . . ἀρχήν** suggests an advanced post, or post some time in occupation. *στάσις*, 'station'; cp. c. 26 *infra*. *ἀρχήν*, adv., 'to begin with,' 'in the first instance'; cp. 7. 220, 8. 128.

9. **λιπαρίῃ τε καὶ ἀρετῇ**: cp. c. 70 *infra*, a sort of *hendiadys*; for the verb *λιπαρέειν*, *perseverare*, cp. cc. 45, 111 *infra*, 8. 144 *supra*.

ἀντέχειν, *resistere*, abs., 8. 68.

10. **διαδόχους τῆς τάξιος**, 'to take our post,' to succeed us in our position. **ἐκλείπειν τ. τ.**, cp. 8. 24. In actual battle *λιποταξία* (*-ιον*) was a capital crime; and mere failure to serve, *λιποστρατία* (*-ιον*), might have serious consequences (cp. 5. 27, Thuc. 1. 99. 1, 6. 76. 3).

12. **Παυσανίης δὲ ἀπεπειρᾶτο.** This *ἀπόπειρα* (cp. 8. 9) *τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, in which they all prove wanting but the Athenians, is a transparent Atticism. The first brush with the Barbarians is presented as a forlorn hope, calling for valiant volunteers; Thermopylai is forgotten, or only remembered to be eclipsed; instead of sending forward some of his own men, out of his 10,000 hoplites and 40,000 light-armed, Pausanias asks for volunteers; and Athenians, a bare 300, step lightly forward into the breach: it is enough!—300 Athenians save the situation at Erythrai; 300 Spartans at Thermopylai could only die! Probably the Athenians were next to the Megarians, whether in the column or in the line, and were ordered forwards as a matter of course, especially as they had a corps of archers. The Megarians

εἴ τινες ἐθέλοιεν ἄλλοι ἐθελονταὶ ἰέναι τε ἐς τὸν χῶρον τοῦτον καὶ τάσσεσθαι διάδοχοι Μεγαρεῦσι. οὐ βουλομένων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναῖοι ὑπεδέξαντο καὶ Ἀθηναίων οἱ τριηκόσιοι λογάδες, τῶν ἐλοχήγεε Ὀλυμπιόδωρος ὁ Λάμπωνος.

22 οὗτοι ἦσαν οἵ τε ὑποδεξάμενοι καὶ οἱ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν παρεόντων Ἑλλήνων ἐς Ἐρυθρὰς ταχθέντες, τοὺς τοξότας προσελόμενοι. μαχομένων δὲ σφέων ἐπὶ χρόνον τέλος τοιόνδε ἐγένετο τῆς μάχης. προσβαλλούσης τῆς ἵππου κατὰ τέλεα, ὁ Μασιστίου προέχων τῶν ἄλλων ἵππος βάλλεται τοξεύματι

14 μεγαρεεῦσι (C) 16 λάμπονος R 22. 1 ἔσαν z || τε om. **β** 3 προελόμενοι B 4 ἐγένετο **β**Pz: ἐγίνετο ἐπὶ **α**C: ἐγένετο ἐπὶ P^{m}, Marc. || προσβαλλούσης **α**C: προσβαλούσης

(with the 1000 Spartans perhaps) presumably remained at their post; even among the Athenians, it was probably not the 300 hoplites but the archers—'perhaps 3000 in number' (Rawlinson)—who kept the Persian cavalry at bay; meanwhile the rest of the Greek column was passing forward, behind Erythrai, westwards towards Hysiai and Plataia, deploying to the left. When this manœuvre was accomplished, the Athenians, Megarians (and Lakedaimonian Chiliad?) might be on the extreme right of the Greek line, and the Lakedaimonian main body on the extreme left, towards Plataia.

15. **ὑπεδέξαντο**: sc. ἰέναι τε κτλ.

οἱ τριηκόσιοι λογάδες: this *corps d'élite* in the Athenian army is remarkable. At this time Athens had little or no cavalry: does this body constitute the aristocratic nucleus of the later institution? Are they like οἱ καλούμενοι ἱππεῖς at Sparta? (Cp. 8. 124.) These men are plainly hoplites; 30 from each tribe? 10, perhaps, from each Trittys? under a λοχαγός (hardly an Attic term; cp. c. 53 *infra*).

16. **Ὀλυμπιόδωρος ὁ Λάμπωνος**: (1) a Samian Lampon meets us in c. 90 *infra*; (2) a better known Aiginetan in c. 78 *infra*; (3) the Athenian here named may be conjecturally regarded as the grandfather of Lampon the diviner (Plutarch, *Perikl.* 6), who was concerned in the foundation of Thurioi (Diodor. 12. 10. 3), figures as author of a rider in the celebrated Eleusinian Decree (*C.I.A.* iv. 276, Dittenberger[1] No. 13, Michel No. 71), and was something of a butt for the Old Comedy (Aristoph. *Bds.* 521 Λάμπων δ' ὄμνυσ' ἔτι καὶ νυνὶ τὸν χῆν' ὅταν ἐξαπατᾷ τι): his patronymic is not preserved, but Olympiodoros may have been his father (or his uncle). Of this Olympiodoros (a high-sounding but not uncommon name) nothing further is known. Hdt. might have read or heard of his fame long before joining the colony at Thurioi, and there is nothing in this passage to lead us to postdate its composition. The story is an integral portion of the Attic legend of Plataia.

22. 1. **πρό** in double sense, local and causal, 'in front of,' 'in defence of' (ὑπέρ), and almost 'instead of' (ἀντί), cp. 7. 152; quite an Athenian formula, cp. c. 27 *infra*.

τῶν παρεόντων is remarkable, and looks rather like a gloss. There is not much point here in a reference to medizing Greeks; and for those on the right side, wherever they were, the Athenians were fighting. If genuine, the words might convey an unconscious hint that the whole army was not yet 'present,' i.e. in position; bearing out the hypothesis above formulated.

2. **ἐς Ἐρυθράς**: not necessarily, or only, the actual town; cp. c. 16 *supra*.

τοὺς τοξότας προσελόμενοι: these 'Archers' are an important element in the Athenian forces; cp. c. 60 *infra*. Rawlinson places their number at 'perhaps 3000.' But cp. c. 29 l. 5 *infra*. It was no doubt they and not the 300 Heavies that proved a match for the Persian cavalry (cp. τοξεύματι just below).

5. **προέχων**: perhaps literally 'in advance of'; cp. προέχοντας τῶν Περσέων 4. 120; *prae aliis longius provectum*, Wesseling. But the horse of Masistios was no doubt conspicuous not merely as leading, but as of superior excellence

τὰ πλευρά, ἀλγήσας δὲ ἵσταταί τε ὀρθὸς καὶ ἀποσείεται τὸν Μασίστιον· πεσόντι δὲ αὐτῷ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτίκα ἐπεκέατο. τὸν δὴ ἵππον αὐτοῦ λαμβάνουσι καὶ αὐτὸν ἀμυνόμενον κτείνουσι, κατ' ἀρχὰς οὐ δυνάμενοι. ἐνεσκεύαστο γὰρ οὕτω· ἐντὸς θώρηκα εἶχε χρύσεον λεπιδωτόν, κατύπερθε δὲ τοῦ θώρηκος κιθῶνα φοινίκεον ἐνεδεδύκεε· τύπτοντες δὲ ἐς τὸν θώρηκα ἐποίευν οὐδέν, πρίν γε δὴ μαθών τις τὸ ποιεύμενον παίει μιν ἐς τὸν ὀφθαλμόν. οὕτω δὴ ἔπεσέ τε καὶ ἀπέθανε. ταῦτα δέ κως γινόμενα ἐλελήθεε τοὺς ἄλλους ἱππέας· οὔτε

---

6 *τε* om. **B**P*z* 7 *ἀπεκέατο* R 8 *τὸν δὴ* **a**C : *τόν τε δὴ* R, Holder, van H. : *τὸν δὲ* P*z* (*τὴν δὲ δὴ* S ap. Gaisford : *τήν τε δὴ* V ap. Holder) 9 *καταρχὰς* P*z* || *ἐσκεύαστο* ? van H. || *οὕτως* **B** 11 *χιτῶνα* **B** || *ἐνδεδύκεε* **B** 12 *θώρηκα αὐτοῦ* *z*

(*προέχειν* 1. 1, 56, 2. 136, 3. 82). *προέχειν* in different senses, c. 4 *supra*, c. 27 *infra*. **τὰ πλευρά**, accus. of reference, or limitation, cp. Index: the plural = 'his side.'

6. **ἵσταταί τε ὀρθὸς καὶ ἀποσείεται**: cp. 7. 88 *στὰς ὀρθὸς ἀπεσείσατο τὸν Φαρνούχεα* (his predecessor ?).

8. **ἀμυνόμενον**, an imperfect, 'trying to defend himself.'

9. **οὐ δυνάμενοι**: sc. *κτείνειν μιν*.

ἐνεσκεύαστο . . οὕτω: the pluperfect here has no particular temporal force; nor again just below *ἐνεδεδύκεε*, which looks a little poetic: the action for the state.

οὕτω referring to what follows = *ὧδε*: cp. 8. 98. 4, 109. 12 *supra*.

10. **εἶχε**, 'he was wearing,' he had on: (1) a scarlet tunic; cp. 7. 61 (*φ*. 7. 76); (2) underneath, just such a cuirass as is given to all the Persian cavalry (7. 76) except that his was (not plain steel rings but) gilt. Hdt. unfortunately omits to describe his headgear (perhaps his *fez* fell off, when he slipped from his horse!) The omission has serious consequences, for Plutarch (Ephoros ?) *Aristeid.* 14 invests him with a helmet, and the blow that ends him is dealt through the eye-hole! The cuirass of Masistios was still to be seen among the *ἀναθήματα* in the shrine of the Polias, on the Akropolis, in the days of Pausanias, 1. 27. 1. (Its genuineness would be more indubitable if it had not been associated with the *ἀκινάκης* of Mardonios—the acquisition of which by Athens naturally puzzled Pausanias. He might have been still more puzzled had he remembered that the *ἀκινάκης* had been stolen in the days of Demosthenes, cp. *c. Timocrat.* 129; it was then valued at, or 'weighing,' L. & S., 300 darics.) Hdt. shows no sign in this passage of having seen these *σκῦλα Μηδικά* (Thuc. 2. 13. 4) before writing this passage; which thus appears of early composition.

11. **τύπτοντες δὲ . . ἐποίευν οὐδέν**, 'their blows on the cuirass were unavailing, till some one perceives the reason (*τὸ ποιεύμενον*) and gives him a prod in the eye.' There is a distinct difference between *τύπτειν* and *παίειν*, the latter corresponding to the Homeric *πλήσσειν* (*πληγή*); cp. J. H. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik* i. (1879), 283. An exact illustration of this incident is to be found on the slab in the left corner of the frieze, south-side temple of Athene Nike, on the Akropolis; Furtwaengler, *Masterpieces*, p. 446, Fig. 181.

13. **οὕτω δὴ ἔπεσε**: he had fallen from his horse once already (*πεσόντι supra*); this is a fresh and final fall; he must have risen from the ground, and defended himself awhile, till the nameless one smote him in the eye (which eye ? Hdt. does not say; and the state of the monument, which he, of course, could not have seen, does not enable us to say for certain: probably the right).

14. **ἐλελήθεε**: it was all over before any of the Persians discovered it; they saw neither the fall from his horse (*πεσόντα*), nor the death-wound being dealt; nor when they retired and then turned (*ὑποστροφή*, cp. c. 14 *supra*) did they perceive what was happening (*τὸ γινόμενον*); it was only when they halted (**ἔστησαν**, cp. c. 23 *infra* *ἀποστήσαντες*, which supports 1st aor., sc. *τοὺς ἵππους*)

γὰρ πεσόντα μιν εἶδον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου οὔτε ἀποθνήσκοντα, ἀναχωρήσιός τε γινομένης καὶ ὑποστροφῆς οὐκ ἔμαθον τὸ γινόμενον. ἐπείτε δὲ ἔστησαν, αὐτίκα ἐπόθεσαν, ὥς σφεας οὐδεὶς ἦν ὁ τάσσων· μαθόντες δὲ τὸ γεγονός, διακελευσάμενοι ἤλαυνον τοὺς ἵππους πάντες, ὡς ἂν τὸν νεκρὸν ἀνελοίατο.

23 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οὐκέτι κατὰ τέλεα προσελαύνοντας τοὺς ἱππέας ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντας, τὴν ἄλλην στρατιὴν ἐπεβώσαντο. ἐν ᾧ δὲ ὁ πεζὸς ἅπας ἐβοήθεε, ἐν τούτῳ μάχη ὀξέα περὶ τοῦ νεκροῦ γίνεται. ἕως μέν νυν μοῦνοι ἦσαν οἱ τριηκόσιοι, ἑσσοῦντό τε πολλὸν καὶ τὸν νεκρὸν ἀπέλειπον· ὡς δέ σφι τὸ πλῆθος ἐπεβοήθησε, οὕτω δὴ οὐκέτι οἱ ἱππόται

17 *γινάμενον* R: *γενόμενον* Gaisford || *ἔστησαν* Marc., *z* 18 *τάξων*? van H. 19 *τόν γε* **B**, Holder, van H. 23. 2 *ἀλλ' ἅμα* **B**, Holder, van H., Stein[3]: *ἀλλὰ* 3 *ἐβώθεε(ν* V) **B**: *ἐπεβώθει* van H. || *ὀξεῖα* codd. *z* 4 *ἐγίνετο* **B** || *ἔσαν* *z* 5 *ἀπέλιπον* *z* 6 *ἐπεβώθησε* van H.

that they missed him at once, when there was no one to dress them; then they perceived what had taken place, and with a shout to encourage each other, they all put spurs to their horses and charged to recover the dead body.

17. **ἐπόθεσαν** Blakesley regarded as corrupt; cp. *ἐπόθησε* 3. 36, *ἐπιποθήσειν* 5. 93, but the variants *ἐπόθεσα*, *ποθέσομαι* are admissible; cp. Goodwin *Gr. Gr.* p. 352, L. & S. *sub v.*

ὥς σφεας οὐδεὶς ἦν ὁ τάσσων: this might be taken to imply that the cavalry unit commanded by Masistios was a very small one, or a very large one: very small, if there was no officer in command but Masistios; very large, if no provision existed to fill a vacancy in the supreme command. If Masistios was sole Hipparch, or even one of two or three, there must have been many subordinate officers in his division: did none of them *pro tempore* assume the command?

19. **ἐλαύνειν** of 'riding' is not common in Hdt.; but cp. 5. 111.

ὡς ἄν, like *ὅκως ἄν*, followed by the optative is frequent in Hdt. (In Homer the opt. with *ἵνα* and *ὅπως* is always pure; with *ὡς* it takes *ἄν* in a few places "where there is clear reference to a single occasion," Monro, *Hom. Gram.* § 306.)

23. 1. **οὐκέτι κατὰ τέλεα . . ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντας**: there is a development in the tactics of the Persian cavalry, not necessarily for the better; it is indeed a result of 'there being no one to order them.' The phrase can hardly mean that the distinction of *τέλεα* was disregarded, the horsemen charging simply pêle-mêle; but rather that now all the *τέλεα* charged together. Nor, again, does this involve a more extended formation, or front; they may have charged *en masse*, almost in column. In any case the description tends to reduce the actual numbers engaged.

2. **ἐπεβώσαντο**: the Megarians, a while before in somewhat similar straits, had to send a message; the Athenians have only to call, to cry aloud, for support. But to whom do they call? In c. 25 below *οἱ Ἕλληνες* appear to be given the credit of the victory in the *ἱππομαχίη*, but even there the phrase is not unambiguous, while here it is not made quite clear that **τὴν ἄλλην στρατιήν** and **ὁ πεζὸς ἅπας** refer to more than the Athenian forces, which in any case would presumably be nearest at hand. However that may be, there is here distinctly a second tactical moment, or development, in the Greek position, finally culminating in the retirement of the Persian cavalry, leaving the body of Masistios in the hands of the Athenians.

4. **ἕως μέν νυν μοῦνοι ἦσαν οἱ τριηκόσιοι**: if the *τοξόται* can be ignored in this fashion, why not the Megarians, Lakedaimonians, and others? In any case **τὸ πλῆθος** could not come up as one man, and least of all if it means not merely *τῶν Ἀθηναίων* but *τῶν Ἑλλήνων*.

ὑπέμενον οὐδέ σφι ἐξεγένετο τὸν νεκρὸν ἀνελέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐκείνῳ ἄλλους προσαπώλεσαν τῶν ἱππέων. ἀποστήσαντες ὦν ὅσον τε δύο στάδια ἐβουλεύοντο ὅ τι χρεὸν εἴη ποιέειν, ἐδόκεε δέ σφι ἀναρχίης ἐούσης ἀπελαύνειν παρὰ Μαρδόνιον. ἀπικο- **24**
μένης δὲ τῆς ἵππου ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον πένθος ἐποιήσαντο Μασιστίου πᾶσά τε ἡ στρατιὴ καὶ Μαρδόνιος μέγιστον, σφέας τε αὐτοὺς κείροντες καὶ τοὺς ἵππους καὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια οἰμωγῇ τε χρεώμενοι ἀπλέτῳ· ἅπασαν γὰρ τὴν Βοιωτίην κατεῖχε ἠχὼ

---

7 *ἐπέμενον* z   8 *προσαπόλεσαν* **B** ‖ *τῶν ἱππέων* del. van H., Holder ‖ *ἀποστάντες* Reiske, Cobet, van H.   9 *δύο* : *δέκα* ? Krueger ‖ *χρεὼν* CPz, van H.   **24.** 2 *ἐποιήσατο* R   5 *χρεόμενοι* P, van H.

---

7. **ἐξεγένετο** : cp. 5. 51.

8. **ἀποστήσαντες** : they halted (their horses) at a distance ; cp. 5. 51 *ἀποστάς* 'he retired'—passages which might tempt the inference that even the aor. 1. of *ἵστημι* came dangerously near being used intransitively. Blakesley regarded this use of *ἀποστῆσαι* as quite 'technical' ; Kuehner, *Ausf. Gramm.* p. 1069, as simply a case of *brachylogy*, where a substantive is to be understood "out of a cognate substantive, or adjective, or adverb, or out of the general context" (*aus dem Zusammenhange der Rede*) ; cp. also App. Crit. and l. 14 *supra*.

9. **ὅσον τε δύο στάδια**, 'about four hundred yards'—say, quarter of a mile ; this halt might leave them still a couple of miles from the *tête du pont* on the Asopos.

ἐβουλεύοντο : the officers, of course. Each *τέλος* must have had a leader, to say nothing of *dekarchs*, etc. But as far as Hdt. is concerned the consultation might be conducted by the entire number, rank and file.

ἐδόκεε might surely be *ἔδοξε*, but cp. c. 5 l. 4 *supra*.

10. **ἀναρχίης ἐούσης** : their *ἄρχων* was gone—they had no commander, for which reason they decided to ride back (*ἀπελαύνειν*) to headquarters (*παρὰ Μαρδόνιον*). These statements will have been based rather on the observations and inferences made on the Greek side than on authorities (Greek or other) in the Persian camp (Thersander, for example, c. 16 *supra*).

24. 2. **πένθος ἐποιήσαντο Μασιστίου . . μέγιστον**, 'made a very great mourning for Masistios' ; cp. 2. 1 *τῆς . . Κῦρος αὐτός τε μέγα πένθος ἐποιήσατο καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι προεῖπε πᾶσι τῶν ἦρχε πένθος ποιέεσθαι.* Their grief would be increased by their failure to recover the body. It was shown partly by the shaving and hair-cutting of man and beast, and partly by wailing, the sound of which was heard throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Was there anything especially 'barbarous' in this style of mourning (*τρόπος ὁ σφέτερος* c. 25) ? Just in like manner the Lakonians bewailed the death of a king 6. 58 ; cp. *οἰμωγῇ διαχρέωνται ἀπλέτῳ ib.* ; though that, indeed, Hdt. regards as Asiatic and barbarous ; cp. also 8. 99 *supra*, 3. 66. Hair-cutting as a sign of grief Hdt., 2. 36, reports as a custom to which Egypt supplies the only exception. Blakesley quotes Eurip. *Alk.* 428 to prove that cutting the manes of the horses was a Thessalian practice ; Larcher shows that it was done by Greeks, and it is recorded in the case of the death of Pelopidas (Plutarch *Pelop.* 33), but perhaps the higher culture tended to discountenance it. Aischylos in the *Persai* (1055) seems to mark it as 'barbarous,' like Hdt. ; and Alexander Magnus was evidently much censured for the extravagance of his grief and mourning (*πένθος*) for Hephaistion ; cp. Arrian, *Anab.* 7. 14. 2. But letting the hair grow abnormally may have much the same significance, though it takes longer to operate ; cp. Suetonius, *Julius* 67.

5. **κατεῖχε ἠχώ.** Blakesley rationalistically understands this to mean merely that wailing was heard wherever troops were posted. That is hardly adequate to the phrase : Boiotia echoed with the sound of lamentation, and mourning and woe. L. & S. is prosier still : 'all Boeotia rang with *the news* !' (*ὡς* ?)

ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἀπολομένου μετά γε Μαρδόνιον λογιμωτάτου παρά τε Πέρσῃσι καὶ βασιλέι.

25 Οἱ μέν νυν βάρβαροι τρόπῳ τῷ σφετέρῳ ἀποθανόντα ἐτίμων Μασίστιον· οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ὡς τὴν ἵππον ἐδέξαντο προσβάλλουσαν καὶ δεξάμενοι ὤσαντο, ἐθάρσησάν τε πολλῷ μᾶλλον καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ἐς ἅμαξαν ἐσθέντες τὸν νεκρὸν παρὰ

---

6 γε om. **B** 7 βασιλεῖ AB 25. 1 ἐτίμων ἀποθανόντα **B** 3 προσβαλοῦσαν SV : προβαλοῦσαν R || ἐθάρρησάν Pz || τε om. punct. post μᾶλλον pos. **B**, Holder, van H., alii 4 ἄμαξαν R

---

6. **ὡς ἀνδρὸς . . βασιλέι.** That Masistios, son of Siromithres, took precedence of every one save Mardonios (Artabazos, for example) in the king's eyes might support the error of Tzetzes, cp. c. 20 *supra*; but it is not conceivable that Hdt. should not have known it had Masistios been an Achaimenid, or nearly related to the king. His value to the king is perhaps but an inference from his position in the army and the mourning made for him. It also heightens the Athenian achievement; cp. c. 64 *infra*.

25. 2. **οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες.** This sentence appears to give credit to 'the Hellenes' for repulsing the cavalry, i.e. to interpret τὸ πλῆθος, ὁ πεζὸς ἅπας in c. 23 *supra* as meaning the whole army. Even if that were the intention of Hdt. the fact would still be disputable: the idea that the whole forces available upon the Greek side were deployed and brought into action before the cavalry skirmish round the body of Masistios was terminated in favour of the Greeks is on the face of it improbable; nor is it easy to understand how such forces could have operated in the given position and locality. But (i.) *quod facit per alium facit per se*; (ii.) the advantage benefited the Greek side as a whole; (iii.) the Greeks had repulsed the Persian cavalry, even if only the Athenians, the Megarians, and possibly the Lakedaimonian πρόδρομοι were actually engaged in what was an affair of *Vorposten*, or, at most, of the head of the column, debouching through the pass.

4. **πρῶτα μὲν . . παρὰ τὰς τάξις ἐκόμιζον.** This proceeding seems to imply (1) that there was a road along which the wagon was drawn by horses (oxen, or mules); (2) that the Greek army was posted in tactical array of some kind. Only one of two roads can well be in question: (*a*) the road from Erythrai past Hysiai to Plataia; (*b*) the road up the Pass to Eleutherai, etc. If the Greek army was already in extended formation, in lines running east and west, as is apparently assumed by Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 11 *ad init.*, and universally assumed for 'the first position' by modern authorities, the Megarians and Athenians would apparently occupy the extreme right wing, and the rest of the army would be to the left of them towards Hysiai and Plataia; or else the Athenians are already on the left wing, the rest of the forces having debouched to the right of them. Two considerations appear to me to favour the former supposition:—(i.) Had the Athenians already been in occupation of the left wing, the question so hotly disputed in the next chapter could hardly have arisen at that point. (ii.) Strategically and tactically the debouchure of the army towards the west is the natural one. If Erythrai was at the foot, or near the foot of the pass, the Greek van would seize on that position, and hold it, while the rest of the army moved from behind out of the pass. There is hardly room for such a development towards the east side, where the pass is flanked by the great mass of rock named by Dr. Grundy 'The High Bastions'; moreover, such a movement would have thrown the Greek front away to the east of the Persian encampment, down stream, exposing them to be outflanked (on their left) by the Persian cavalry. Again, the development of the Greek first position westwards accords with the subsequent movement reported in this chapter, and also places the rear of the column, when developed, in front of the two other roads, or passes, crossing Kithairon (to Eleutherai and to

τὰς τάξις ἐκόμιζον· ὁ δὲ νεκρὸς ἦν θέης ἄξιος μεγάθεος εἵνεκα καὶ κάλλεος, τῶν δὴ εἵνεκα καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίευν· ἐκλείποντες τὰς τάξις ἐφοίτων θεησόμενοι Μασίστιον. *μετὰ δὲ ἔδοξέ σφι*

---

5 *τάξεις* C || *ἐκομίζοντο* **B** || *ἔην* z || *μεγάθεός τε* coni. Stein, adm. van H. 6 *τῶν δὴ* Krueger, Stein², Holder, van H.: *τῶν δὲ* codd., Stein¹: *τῶνδε* z || *ταῦτα ἐποίευν·* del. Krueger, van H. (*ἐποίεον* PRSz) || *ἐκλιπόντες* **B**, van H. 7 *τάξεις* BC || *ἐφοίτεον* **B**, Stein¹, van H.: *καὶ ἐφοίτων* z

---

Megara). Finally, as, upon the above supposition, the Lakedaimonians in the first position come to stand on the extreme left, and the Athenians on the right, not only is there some excuse for the controversy in the next chapter, when the army moves down-hill to 'the second position,' but also a clue is perhaps found to the real or recorded exchange of positions between the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians in the second position (cc. 46, 47 *infra*), though for that exchange, or supposed exchange, other fair explanations may also be forthcoming. It is possible, then, that the body of Masistios was conveyed upon a wagon along the road running from Erythrai towards Plataia, no doubt mostly behind the Greek lines, as finally developed in 'the first position.' It is also, however, possible that the wagon was taken simply up the road through the pass to the rear, the sight of it mightily encouraging the rear ranks of the column, which had not yet fully emerged on to the *ὑπωρέη*. What the ultimate destination of the wagon, or what became of the corpse, Hdt. unfortunately does not inform us; presumably he did not know. The *θώρηξ* found its way to Athens; cp. c. 22 *supra*.

5. **ὁ δὲ νεκρὸς ἦν θέης ἄξιος.** Hdt. writes as though he had seen it; but of course he had not. Tall and comely as the corpse was, Masistios does not seem to have been 'heroized' like Artachaies at Akanthos, 7. 117, or Philip of Kroton at Segesta, 5. 47. Cp. c. 20 *supra*. Hdt. also omits to specify what became of his noble Nesaian charger: was he led to his master's grave, and perhaps sacrificed thereon? Or did he escape with the squadron, after his master's fall? Or die of his wound on the field?

6. **ταῦτα ἐποίευν.** The difficulty may be surmounted (*a*) by deleting *ταῦτα ἐποίευν* with Krüger; (*b*) by bracketing *ἐκλείποντες . . Μασίστιον* as a gloss; (*c*) by understanding, with Stein, *ταῦτα = τάδε*. Cp. *οὕτω = ὧδε* c. 22 *supra*.

7. **ἔδοξέ σφι ἐπικαταβῆναι ἐς Πλαταιάς:** this is a formal decision of the council of war, cp. c. 51 *infra*, or of the commander-in-chief. That it was taken at this moment may not be strictly correct. Hdt. does not say for how long the Greeks occupied 'the first position,' whether for days, or only for hours. The process by which the advance was effected may have been as follows:—The Megarians (or perhaps *οἱ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας κτλ.*, cp. c. 69) had seized and occupied Erythrai, until relieved by the Athenians, who in their turn have been supported by more and more of the forces, until *ὁ πεζὸς ἅπας* has gradually arrived on the scene. The Athenians and Megarians may have moved out of Erythrai, westwards towards Hysiai first, and then beyond, Erythrai being occupied in succession by the various contingents, without further fighting, and the position being constantly developed westwards, until finally the Athenians and Megarians have pushed along the *ὑπωρέη* far enough to the west to allow of the Lakedaimonians in the rear occupying Erythrai on the extreme right of the position. If this was the process, then the question of precedence between the Athenians and Tegeatai was virtually settled beforehand. But it seems more probable that, as above suggested, the head of the column, composed of the Megarians (and the Spartan Chiliad?) supported by the Athenians continued to hold Erythrai, while the rest of the army deployed behind Erythrai to the west, along the high ground, in front of Hysiai and towards Plataia. This movement would be facilitated by the

ἐπικαταβῆναι ἐς Πλαταιάς· ὁ γὰρ χῶρος ἐφαίνετο πολλῷ ἐὼν ἐπιτηδεότερός σφι ἐνστρατοπεδεύεσθαι ὁ Πλαταιικὸς τοῦ Ἐρυθραίου τά τε ἄλλα καὶ εὐυδρότερος. ἐς τοῦτον δὴ τὸν χῶρον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην τὴν Γαργαφίην τὴν ἐν τῷ χώρῳ τούτῳ ἐοῦσαν ἔδοξέ σφι χρεὸν εἶναι ἀπικέσθαι καὶ διαταχθέντας στρατοπεδεύεσθαι. ἀναλαβόντες δὲ τὰ ὅπλα ἤισαν διὰ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος παρὰ Ὑσιὰς ἐς τὴν Πλαταιίδα γῆν,

9 ἐπιτηδεώτερος CP*z*, van H. || πλαταϊκὸς **α** 10 εὐυδρότερος <ἐών> Krueger 12 χρεὼν P*z*, van H. 14 ὑπωρίης V : ὑπωρείης || περὶ *z* || ὑασιὰς R

existence of the roads from Erythrai to Plataia, and from Dryoskephalai to Plataia.

8. **ἐπικαταβῆναι** gives two characteristics of the movement: (*a*) it was down-hill, from higher to lower ground; (*b*) it was a forward, or offensive movement; cp. 8. 38. **ἐς Πλαταιάς** gives a third: (*c*) it was into Plataian territory (cp. c. 16 *supra*). This might involve not merely a northerly, but a north-westerly direction; that it was not due west, or on to Plataia itself, or its ruins, is abundantly clear both from the immediately ensuing topography, and from the subsequent narrative (cp. c. 52 *infra*).

ὁ γὰρ χῶρος κτλ. The reasons given for the move are admittedly incomplete (*τά τε ἄλλα καί*); the only one emphasized is the water supply, no doubt a reason of supreme importance, especially with a view to encamping (*ἐνστρατοπεδεύεσθαι*), less important, however, with a view to pure fighting (*ἐμμαχέσασθαι* c. 7 *supra*) which must have been under consideration. If the Greeks did not want to provoke a battle they would have remained in their first position, or moved at once to the 'Island' (c. 51 *infra*). The fact that the battle was not finally fought exactly in the second position has, perhaps, led to the 'offensive' or at least provocative character of this forward movement being ignored. Any one could appreciate the reason given, which was manifest to the merest tiro (**ἐφαίνετο ἐών**). **τὴν Γαργαφίην**, see below.

12. **διαταχθέντας στρατοπεδεύεσθαι**: before the new position was occupied, before the Laager there was formed, and presumably either in the first position itself, or in the process of moving from the first position to the second, a *διάταξις* was to be effected, i.e. the existing arrangement and order of the *τάξεις* was to be modified, or at any rate the army was to be put in battle-array; it had not therefore previously been in battle-array, but in marching order, or at least not in the order of battle approved by the commanders. (Cp. 8. 70 *παρεκρίθησαν διαταχθέντες*, of the movement of the Persian fleet into line of battle; *διέτασσε* 6. 107, *ὡς δέ σφι διετέτακτο* 6. 112 *acie ordinata*; cp. also 1. 80 *ὡς δέ οἱ πάντες διετετάχατο* with the context.) But perhaps Hdt. is getting a little out of his depth here; the Greeks can hardly have intended to encamp for any length of time on the advanced position 'on the Asopos.'

13. **ἀναλαβόντες δὲ τὰ ὅπλα**: cp. cc. 53, 57 *infra*. The heavy arms (shields, etc.) were piled for the halt, or in camp, and 'taken up' again before moving. The army had probably bivouacked at least one night in the position at Erythrai—though Hdt. does not actually say so.

ἤισαν διὰ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος: nothing in these words proves this a down-hill march; that idea must be borrowed from the *ἐπικαταβῆναι* above, and from the real topography or choriography; otherwise the words might describe the movement of a column direct on Plataia, or of a series of contingents extending themselves *en échelon* in that direction.

14. **παρὰ Ὑσιάς.** Strabo 404 *ἔνιοι δὲ τὰς Ὑσιὰς Ὑρίην λέγεσθαί φασι, τῆς Παρασωπίας οὖσαν ὑπὸ τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι πλησίον Ἐρυθρῶν ἐν τῇ μεσογαίᾳ.* It was 'a little to the right' of the road from Eleutherai to Plataiai; Pausan. 9. 2. 1. There was a road running from Thebes to Eleutherai *via* Hysiai (or rather *via* Erythrai ?), Pausan. 9. 1. 6, by which the Thebans circumvented the Plataians in 373 B.C. The position of Hysiai was

ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἐτάσσοντο κατὰ ἔθνεα πλησίον τῆς τε κρήνης

---

plainly west of Erythrai and east of Plataia; cp. c. 15 *supra ad f.*; but whether Hysiai was higher up hill, or on lower ground than Erythrai, is not so evident. Tradition (cp. G. B. Grundy, *G.P.W.* p. 464) identifies the site with that of the existing village of *Kriekouki*: Dr. Grundy himself places it outside the area of the existing village, and higher up the hill to the south. I think it probable that just as Erythrai commanded the Dryoskephalai Pass, and the direct road from Thebes to Eleutherai-Eleusis-Athens, so Hysiai commanded the loop-road from Plataia which struck into the main road behind the ridge, by a second pass; while Plataia itself might be taken to command the third road and pass across the ridge of Kithairon, that leading direct to Megara. These three passes cross the ridge at intervals of about a mile (roughly); but Plataia lay somewhat further in advance (and to the west) of Pass III. than Hysiai and Erythrai of Passes II. and I. respectively.

ἐς τὴν Πλαταιίδα γῆν. The territory of Plataia extended northwards right down to the Asopos (cp. c. 15 *supra*); how far it extended eastwards is not so clear. Hysiai (Strabo 404) and Erythrai (Strabo 409) were both in the Παρασωπία, and their territories (whether independent or not) reached down to the river-course. It may be conjectured that the whole water-system of the Oëroë (c. 51 *infra*) belonged to Plataia, while lower down, and to the north, stream A. 4 among the tributaries of the Asopos, descending from Kithairon, may have formed a boundary between the Πλαταιΐς and the Ὑσιαΐς. This would place Gargaphia, on every theory, within the *Plataiis*, as also the Heroon of Androkrates; it would leave the Demetrion (c. 62 *infra*) and the 'Long Ridge' in the *Hysiaiis*. The boundary between the territory of Hysiai and that of Erythrai might perhaps be found in the considerable stream A. 6 which Dr. Grundy conjecturally identifies with the Moloeis (c. 57 *infra*). This identification would suit the position suggested above, on the Plataia-Athens pass, for the site of Hysiai very well, and would lead to the inclusion of the Argiopion (c. 57 *infra*) in the territory of Hysiai.

15. **ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἐτάσσοντο κατὰ ἔθνεα.** This assertion generates two difficulties. (1) Were not the Greeks already τεταγμένοι κατ' ἔθνεα? Most certainly, the various τάξεις, the various contingents in the first position, Megarians, Athenians, etc., were 'ethnic.' (2) Did the Greeks all arrive at the new position and then proceed to the διάταξις? Such an operation is practically incredible. The order in which the ethnic τάξεις should stand, or laager, in the new (i.e. 'second,' or more strictly third) position must have been determined, in the main, before the position was occupied; the Greeks could neither have arrived there in a confused mass, with all the various ἔθνη indiscriminately mixed up, as though the proceeding were a pêle-mêle flight, not a forward movement in the face of the enemy; nor, again, could the various ethnic contingents, each in itself compact, have advanced and taken up a station at random round the fountain of Gargaphia. Whatever the order in which the Greeks had bivouacked in the first position, by Erythrai (or in the second position, west thereof), the order of battle, and the order of the stations in the Asopos position, must have been decided before the forces moved forward to occupy it. But if, as above suggested, the Athenians, in the final development of the first position, occupied the extreme right, at Erythrai, while the Tegeatai were on the left, next the Spartans, there might be a question whether, when the Spartans moved forward to the right, the Tegeatai should follow them, or simply move forward into position so as to form the extreme left of the Greek line in 'the second (i.e. third) position.'

πλησίον τῆς τε κρήνης τῆς Γαργαφίης: the position and identity of Gargaphia have been disputed.

(i.) It was identified by Squire (*ap.* Walpole, *Memoirs*, 338 ff.) and by Clarke (*Travels*, ii. 3, p. 83) with the spring now called *Vergutiani*. Blakesley unfortunately acquiesced in this identification, which is quite hopeless, Vergutiani being high up on the ὑπωρέη, and belonging to the water-system of the Oëroë. (The apparent 'second' position of the Greeks is described below, c. 30, as ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ. Perhaps in the true second position Vergutiani was within, or just behind, their lines.)

(ii.) Leake (*N.G.* ii. 332, 343) and Vischer (*Erinnerungen*, p. 549) accept the traditional identification of Gargaphia with a spring now known as *Apotripi*,

τῆς Γαργαφίης καὶ τοῦ τεμένεος τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτεος τοῦ ἥρωος, διὰ ὄχθων τε οὐκ ὑψηλῶν καὶ ἀπέδου χώρου.

17 δι' PRz || χωρίου CPz, Gaisford, alii

just north of and below the (ruined) Church of St. John on the 'Asopos Ridge': the head-waters in fact of stream A. 1 in G. B. Grundy's Maps. This identification is *prima facie* valid.

(iii.) Grote (followed by Rawlinson and Stein) regarded Gargaphia as non-existent at the present day, or, what comes to the same thing, unidentifiable. Grote unfortunately never visited the scenes with which his great work is concerned. No one who has actually seen the battle-field of Plataia, or considered its problems *in loco*, will easily acquiesce in this *non possumus*.

(iv.) Dr. G. B. Grundy identifies the spring of Gargaphia with an extant spring some three-quarters of a mile, or less, east (slightly by north) of Apotripi, and virtually in the same hollow ground, or trough, as Apotripi, surrounding the Asopos Ridge. This spring is one of the head-waters of the stream A. 4 forming the east boundary of the Asopos Ridge, and possibly, as above suggested, the frontier between the Plataiis and the Hysiaiis. Not much is gained by this shift of Gargaphia one-half to three-quarters of a mile eastward: as a matter of fact both springs in question will have been within the Greek lines; but Dr. Grundy's suggestion tends to put the spring on the extreme right of the Greek army, which might appear an advantage, especially to those who take Gargaphia and the Androkrateion as making two termini; see next note.

Hdt. himself makes Gargaphia 10 stades from the Island, c. 51 *infra*, and 20 stades from the Heraion, c. 52 *infra*. These measurements are obviously mere round numbers, and of very little value except as making (i.) *supra* more than ever impossible. The distance to the 'Island' (as identified by Dr. Grundy) would suit either spring; the distance to the Heraion (whatever its exact site) is in either case an over-estimate. If the Island had been where Leake and Vischer put it, the distance would have suited Apotripi better than the alternative.

(v.) Goettling, *Gesam. Abh.* p. 136, identified Gargaphia with a spring near Plataia: the same objections are fatal to this proposal as to (i.). The name Gargaphia = *Platanisti*, 'Poplar-well.' *γάργα* = *αἴγειρος*, Hesych. *γάρκα*, 'Macedonian,' a rod, *ib.* We may suppose the well-head shaded with a grove of poplars, or plane-trees.

16. **τοῦ τεμένεος τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτεος τοῦ ἥρωος.** Thuc. 3. 24. 1 places *τὸ τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτους ἡρῷον* on the right of the direct road from Plataia to Thebes; cp. Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 11 *αὐτοῦ δ' ἦν καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτους ἡρῷον ἐγγὺς ἄλσει πυκνῶν καὶ συσκίων δένδρων περιεχόμενον.* These, with Hdt., are the only authorities on the exact site, and they leave much to be desired. *αὐτοῦ* in Plutarch does not mean (*pace* Rawlinson) *ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ* but simply *ἐν τῇ Πλαταιίδι.* As far as Thucydides goes, the Heroon is anywhere, within reach, on the right of the road from Plataia to Thebes. There is no evidence that Thucydides himself ever visited Plataia, and the '5 or 6 stades' mentioned in the context need not be used to prejudice the position of the Hero's house. Little is known of Androkrates, but he was plainly the greatest of the local Heroes of Plataia, of the *ἀρχηγέται Πλαταιέων*, seven in number, mentioned in the 'oracle' *ap.* Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 11; cp. Rohde, *Psyche* (1890) p. 161. A conspicuous site may be posited for his Heroon. If such a site is forthcoming, and fits in well with 'the second (i.e. third) position' of the Greeks before Plataia in 479 B.C., it cannot be sacrificed to an *obiter dictum* in Thucydides. I have therefore no hesitation in accepting the Church of St. John (first proposed by W. J. Woodhouse, *J.H.S.* xviii. (1898) 38 ff.) as marking the Androkrateion as surely as the Church of St. Demetrion on the neighbouring ridge to the east marks one of the temples of Eleusinian Demeter (as proposed by Dr. Grundy; cp. c. 57 *infra*).

There is nothing to show that Hdt. in this passage conceived Gargaphia as marking the extreme right of the Greek position, and the Androkrateion as marking the extreme left, a point on which Rawlinson rightly demurs to Grote. The Church of St. John occupies the lower of two summits (300 and 360 ft. respectively above the Asopos Bridge)

Ἐνθαῦτα ἐν τῇ διατάξι ἐγένετο λόγων πολλῶν ὠθισμὸς **26**
Τεγεητέων τε καὶ Ἀθηναίων· ἐδικαίευν γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἑκάτεροι
ἔχειν τὸ ἕτερον κέρας, καὶ καινὰ καὶ παλαιὰ παραφέροντες

---

26. 1 διατάξι Pz: διατάξει || πολλὸς **β**, Holder, van H. 2 ἐδικαίουν **a**, van H. || αὐτέων z

---

which are both alike comprised in the 'Asopos Ridge.' The Greeks, now offering battle, will have occupied both these summits, directly in advance of the two springs, or well-heads, (ii.) and (iv.) above, which dispute the name Gargaphia, and both sources will have been used by the troops: Dr. Grundy's Gargaphia by the right wing, Apotripi by the centre, while the Athenians and left wing may have had to draw from the stream A. 1 (not wholly dependent on Apotripi for its water). This position suits the description *διὰ ὄχθων τε οὐκ ὑψηλῶν καὶ ἀπέδου χώρου*. It was an *ἄπεδος χῶρος* though not a *πεδίον*. Dr. Grundy places the Greeks to the south, just above the trough between streams A. 1 and A. 4 and with the wells in front of them.

26. 1. **ἐνθαῦτα ἐν τῇ διατάξι.** If Hdt. means that the dispute between the Tegeatans and Athenians took place in the Asopos position, and before the forces are disposed in position, he means what is manifestly absurd. What then does he suppose the order to have been in the previous position? Hdt. has not concerned himself to realize the conditions of his own story; but the story, however fantastic, doubtless has some ground in actual occurrences. Some time or other, at some place or other, it was discussed and decided what the order of battle should be on the Greek side. In Attica the Athenians might conceivably have claimed the post of honour on the right wing, though such a claim had hardly been consistent with the *Hegemonia* of the Spartans; but it appears that the Athenians with the Megarians actually formed the head of the marching column (*agmen*) from Eleusis to Erythrai. In a Spartan army the king commanded from the centre; cp. Thuc. 5. 72. 4 (but Kleombrotos apparently commanded the right wing at Leuktra, Plutarch, *Pelop.* 23). It is conceivable that the question of the exact order of battle was not fully resolved before the Greeks reached Erythrai; or, again, that the turn taken by the 'Hippomachy,' and the development of the first Greek position, brought about an order and a situation which had not been distinctly foreseen. The Greek ethnic contingents must have extended along the *ὑπωρέη* in some definite order, whether the Athenians were then on the extreme left or on the extreme right. In the latter case the manœuvre described below in c. 46 may have taken place, or have been anticipated, and so brought the Athenians on to the left wing, the Lakedaimonians on to the right; or this result may have been obtained by an advance *en échelon* down the *ὑπωρέη* and on to the Asopos Ridge. If (as appears to me less probable) the Athenians had evacuated Erythrai and moved to the left, along the *ὑπωρέη*, making room for the remainder of the marching column to form up in line, the Lakedaimonians being on the extreme right; then, this order had probably been already decided on, and it was too late for the Tegeatai to enter a claim; but the story of the dispute may come to have been associated with the transition from the *agmen* to the *acies*, and that transition itself to be confounded with the advance on to the Asopos. Hdt., for whom the problem of the conversion of the marching column, or columns, into the fighting line simply does not exist, has placed the record as an appendix to a description of the (second) position, in which the disposition of the forces in fighting array, in actual line of battle, was effected, or made effective.

λόγων πολλῶν ὠθισμός: cp. 8. 78.

2. **Τεγεητέων τε καὶ Ἀθηναίων**: 500 Tegeatai had been in the army of Leonidas, 7. 202; there are 1500 present on this occasion. (The city has been mentioned 7. 170, but in a passage of later composition.)

ἐδικαίευν: cp. 8. 126.

αὐτοὶ ἑκάτεροι: Baehr cps. 3. 82 *αὐτὸς γὰρ ἕκαστος κτλ.*, 5. 13 *αὐτὰ ἕκαστα* (*v.l.* *ταῦτα*). For the plural cp. 7. 1. 7.

3. **ἔχειν τὸ ἕτερον κέρας**: a strong *ἔχειν*. Rawlinson's translation is right, 'one of the wings,' following Schweighaeuser, who refuted Valckenaer's interpretation of the term as a euphemism

ἔργα. τοῦτο μὲν οἱ Τεγεῆται ἔλεγον τάδε. “ἡμεῖς αἰεί κοτε ἀξιεύμεθα ταύτης τῆς τάξιος ἐκ τῶν συμμάχων ἁπάντων, ὅσαι ἤδη ἔξοδοι κοιναὶ ἐγένοντο Πελοποννησίοισι καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν καὶ τὸ νέον, ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου ἐπείτε Ἡρακλεῖδαι ἐπειρῶντο

---

4 ἀεί **B**, Holder 5 τάξιος . . ἐγένοντο om. R: στάσιος z 6 ἔξοδοι ἤδη **a** || πάλαι **B**, van H. 7 ἐπεὶ Paris. 1635 z || ἐπειρέοντο van H.

---

for *sinistrum cornu*; cp. *infra*: ὁκοτέρου βούλεσθε κέρεος ἄρχειν παρίεμεν. The Lakedaimonians were, of course, sure to take the right.

παραφέροντες: used literally, of more material arguments, 3. 130 μάστιγάς τε καὶ κέντρα παραφέρειν ἐς τὸ μέσον.

4. **τοῦτο μέν** has here no τοῦτο δέ following, but the antithesis is supplied in more extended terms at the beginning of the next chapter.

6. **ἔξοδοι κοιναί**: i.e. 'expeditions of the confederacy'; cp. c. 11 *supra*; this, which is the antecedent, has been placed within the relative clause, and then attracted into the same case as ὅσαι.

καὶ . . καί: the strong co-ordination occurs three times in this c., ll. 3, 25.

7. **τὸ νέον**, more usual without the article; cp. τὰ νεώτερα 6. 35.

Ἡρακλεῖδαι ἐπειρῶντο . . κατιόντες. 'The sons of Herakles attempted to effect their return from exile . .' πειρᾶσθαι with participle, as 7. 139. 7 *supra*. Hdt., by the mouth of the Tegeatai, here makes reference to the all-important legend of the Expulsion, or Banishment, and Return of the Herakleids (ἡ κάθοδος τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν), the sobriquet in the fifth century, as this passage among others proves, for the Dorian Conquest. One important chapter in the story of 'the Restoration' Hdt. elsewhere (6. 55) declines to narrate, on the ground that it has already been put on record by other writers. That reason has not operated with him here to preclude his telling the story of the duel between Hyllos and Echemos, and the failure of the first attempt of the 'exiles' to return. (Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.)

The antecedents of the story of the Duel are supplied in part by the speech of the Athenians in c. 27, in part by Thucyd. 1. 9. 2 (cp. Apollod. *Biblioth.* 2. 8). The story was that the 'Herakleids' or 'Perseids,' as they were in the last resort (cp. 6. 53), had been deposed by the 'Pelopids' (the Egyptian by the Asiatic!), Eurystheus, himself a Perseid, having first expelled the Herakleids and then perished in Attica, warring against them, leaving Atreus (the Pelopid) in possession at Mykenai.

To this 'fytte' succeeds the Duel of Hyllos and the 'Arkadian' king recorded in this place by Hdt. Thereafter for three generations, a century, the Herakleids abandon the attempt to 'return,' until, as leaders of the Dorians, and led by the one-eyed Aitolian Oxylos, they cross from Naupaktos, and effect the conquests of the three great districts, Argolis, Laconia, Messenia.

The subjection of Herakles to Eurystheus appears in Homer (*Il.* 15. 639 f.), where the Hero is despatched to Hell to fetch the Hound (*Il.* 8. 363 ff., *Od.* 11. 617–627). Herakles also figures as the enemy of the Neleids (*Il.* 11. 689 ff.). Is this a Dorian Herakles? The *Iliad* of course will know nothing of Dorians as such. How old the 'Herakleid' legend is one can hardly say; Tyrtaios, *Fr.* 2, in which it appears (though not explicitly as a 'Return'), even if genuine, is not older than the middle of the seventh century B.C. The expedition of Eurystheus into Attica against Hyllos and the Herakleids was narrated by Hekataios, cp. Longinus 27. 2 (ed.[2] Vahlen p. 41) and Pherekydes (Anton. Lib. *Metam.* c. 33, *Mythogr. Gr.* ed. Westermann p. 230). Cp. Diodor. 4. 38. Such elder writers as these are covered by Thucydides' remarkable phrase: οἱ τὰ σαφέστατα Πελοποννησίων μνήμῃ παρὰ τῶν πρότερον δεδεγμένοι *l.c.* Before Hdt. wrote this passage there was undoubtedly a rich prose literature on Herakles and the Herakleids, to say nothing of the poetic development attested by Hesiod, Pindar, and the dramatists; and in regard to Hdt. it is especially to be remembered that his uncle Panyasis had composed an epic on Herakles in 9000 verses; Suidas *s.v.* Πανύασις. Cp. Introduction, § 10.

μετὰ τὸν Εὐρυσθέος θάνατον κατιόντες ἐς Πελοπόννησον· τότε εὑρόμεθα τοῦτο διὰ πρῆγμα τοιόνδε. ἐπεὶ μετὰ Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Ἰώνων τῶν τότε ἐόντων ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ ἐκβοηθήσαντες ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἱζόμεθα ἀντίοι τοῖσι κατιοῦσι, τότε ὦν λόγος Ὕλλον ἀγορεύσασθαι ὡς χρεὸν εἴη τὸν μὲν στρατὸν τῷ στρατῷ μὴ ἀνακινδυνεύειν συμβάλλοντα, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Πελοποννησίου στρατοπέδου τὸν ἂν σφέων αὐτῶν κρίνωσι εἶναι ἄριστον, τοῦτόν οἱ μουνομαχῆσαι ἐπὶ διακειμένοισι. ἔδοξέ τε τοῖσι Πελοποννησίοισι ταῦτα εἶναι ποιητέα καὶ ἔταμον ὅρκιον ἐπὶ λόγῳ τοιῷδε, ἢν μὲν Ὕλλος νικήσῃ τὸν Πελοποννησίων ἡγεμόνα, κατιέναι Ἡρακλείδας ἐπὶ τὰ πατρώια, ἢν δὲ νικηθῇ, τὰ ἔμπαλιν Ἡρακλείδας ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἀπάγειν τὴν στρατιὴν ἑκατόν τε ἐτέων μὴ ζητῆσαι κάτοδον ἐς Πελο-

8 *μετ'* **ß**P*z* || *εὐρυσθένεος* S, Marc. 9 *ἐπείτε*? van H. 10 *πελοπονήσω* **ß** ap. Holder || *ἐκβωθήσαντες* van H. 11 *ἀντίον* B 12 *ἀγορήσασθαι* C, Grashof, van H. || *χρεὼν* CP*z*, van H. 13 *συμβαλοντα* (sic) **α** 14 *ἄν σφεων* A*z* || *αὐτέων* *z* || *εἶναι* om. P 16 *ὅρκια* BC, Schaefer 17 *τῶν* S 18 *ἐπὶ . . Ἡρακλείδας* om. **ß** || *πατρῶια* AB : *πατρῶα* C : *πατρῷα* *z*

9. **εὑρόμεθα** : cp. c. 6 *supra*, and 3. 148 *εὑρήσεται τιμωρίην*—neither passage, however, is quite exactly parallel with this, *ἀλεωρή, τιμωρίη*, being more concrete than **τοῦτο.** Cp. l. 24 *infra*.

μετὰ Ἀχαιῶν. Hdt. fully shares the fifth-century theory that the Achaians were to be found in the Peloponnesos long before the Dorians; cp. 8. 73.

10. **Ἰώνων τῶν τότε ἐόντων ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ** : cp. 8. 73; most of the Ionians were supposed to have migrated into Asia *via* Athens, cp. 1. 145. (Blakesley's idea that the Megarians are here intended is unfortunate.)

ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμόν : the scene is laid by Pausanias also (1. 44. 10 *ad f.*) on the frontiers of Korinthia and Megaris.

12. **Ὕλλον** : the son of Herakles, cp. 7. 204, as here 'goes without saying.'

ἀγορεύσασθαι : a unique instance of the middle use in this verb; *edicendum curasse*, Baehr; but cp. App. Crit.

14. **στρατοπέδου** = *στρατιᾶς, στρατοῦ.*

15. **μουνομαχῆσαι**, to engage in a *μονομαχία*, or 'single combat'; cp. 5. 1, 7. 104; in c. 27 *infra* the word is used in a somewhat different sense (if the reading is correct).

ἐπὶ διακειμένοισι : cp. *ἐπὶ λόγῳ τοιῷδε* just below; *συγκειμένοισι* would be more in accord with usage; cp. 3. 58, c. 52 *infra*, etc. Hesiod, *Scut. Her.* 20 *ὣς γάρ οἱ διέκειτο θεοὶ δ' ἐπιμάρτυροι ἦσαν.*

ἔδοξε : a decision, decree.

16. **ἔταμον ὅρκιον** : *ὅρκιον* is properly the neut. adj.; cp. L. & S., 'to slay the sacrificial animal for the treaty' = 'to make a solemn agreement.' So *ὅρκιον, ὅρκια* come to stand for the treaty itself, in such phrases as *ὅρκιον ποιεῖσθαι* 1. 141, etc. *μένειν τὸ ὅρκιον κατὰ χώρην* in immediate juxtaposition with *τάμνοντες ὅρκια* 4. 201.

17. **τὸν Πελοποννησίων ἡγεμόνα** turns out to be not Atreus but the Arkadian king Echemos! The term 'Peloponnesian' in any case involves no anachronism: *ex hypothesi* the Pelopids are in possession and the name of Pelops given to the peninsula, cp. Thuc. *l.c.*

18. **τὰ πατρώια**, sc. *γέρεα.*

19. **τὰ ἔμπαλιν** : 1. 207 *ἔχω γνώμην . . τὰ ἔμπαλιν ἢ οὗτοι*, c. 56 *infra* *Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ . . ἤισαν τὰ ἔμπαλιν ἢ Λακεδαιμόνιοι*, seem to show that Schweighaeuser's *e contrario, vicissim*, is right (Stein takes it here = *ὀπίσω* with *ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι*—which is strong enough in itself: the position also favours the former rendering).

20. **ἑκατόν τε ἐτέων** : i.e. three generations, 2. 142, cp. 7. 171 (Hyllos)—(1) Kleodaios; (2) Aristomachos; (3) his

πόννησον. προεκρίθη τε δὴ ἐκ πάντων τῶν συμμάχων ἐθελοντὴς Ἔχεμος ὁ Ἠερόπου τοῦ Κηφέος στρατηγός τε ἐὼν καὶ βασιλεὺς ἡμέτερος, καὶ ἐμουνομάχησέ τε καὶ ἀπέκτεινε Ὕλλον. ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἔργου εὑρόμεθα ἐν Πελοποννησίοισί γε τοῖσι τότε καὶ ἄλλα γέρεα μεγάλα, τὰ διατελέομεν ἔχοντες, καὶ τοῦ κέρεος τοῦ ἑτέρου αἰεὶ ἡγεμονεύειν κοινῆς ἐξόδου γινομένης. ὑμῖν μέν νυν ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐκ ἀντιεύμεθα, ἀλλὰ διδόντες αἵρεσιν ὁκοτέρου βούλεσθε κέρεος ἄρχειν παρίεμεν· τοῦ δὲ ἑτέρου φαμὲν ἡμέας ἱκνέεσθαι ἡγεμονεύειν κατά περ ἐν τῷ πρόσθε χρόνῳ. χωρίς τε τούτου τοῦ ἀπηγημένου ἔργου ἀξιονικότεροι εἰμὲν Ἀθηναίων ταύτην τὴν τάξιν ἔχειν. πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ εὖ ἔχοντες πρὸς ὑμέας ἡμῖν, ἄνδρες Σπαρτιῆται,

---

21 *δὴ* om. S || *τῶν* om. 𝔅Pz, Holder, van H. 22 *ἠρόπου* C : *ἠροπέου* Marc. || *φυγέος* 𝔅 : *Phrygis* Valla : *Κηφέος* coni. Paulmier et Stein, recepi cum van H. : *Φηγέος* 23 *τε* : *σε* R 24 *ἐν τοῖσι* z || *γε* Stein : *τε* ABC : om. reliqui 26 *ἀεὶ* 𝔅, Holder 29 <*ἐς*> *ἡμέας* Koen, van H. || *ἱκνεῖσθαι* van H. : *ἱκέσθαι* C : om. S 30 *πρόσθεν* 𝔞z 31 *ἀξιονικώτεροι ἦμεν* Marc. 32 *γάρ τε καὶ* z

---

three sons, Temenos, Kresphontes, Aristodemos; cp. 7. 204, 8. 131, 137; also 6. 52. The condition 'lets the cat out of the bag,' i.e. anticipates the 'Return.' Diodor. 4. 58 gives fifty years as the limit.

21. **προεκρίθη τε . . ἐθελοντής**: this arrangement, a selection of volunteers, is perhaps necessary to explain why Hyllos was not faced by the *Πελοποννησίων ἡγεμών*—but we are left to discover for ourselves that this title could not be applied to Echemos. The 'Peloponnesian symmachy,' be it observed, is in full swing a century before the 'Restoration.'

22. **Ἔχεμος ὁ Ἠερόπου τοῦ Κηφέος**: Echemos was known to Pindar, *Ol.* 10. 66 *ὁ δὲ πάλᾳ κυδαίνων Ἔχεμος Τεγέαν*. Diodoros *l.c.* adds nothing to Hdt. Pausanias, 1. 41. 2, 8. 5. 1, shows some variation in the traditions: in the former passage dating the event 'to the reign of Orestes,' in the latter correcting the date, and making Echemos son of Aeropos (son of Kepheus, son of Aleus), and successor of Lykourgos as king of Arkadia, husband moreover of Timandra, daughter of Tyndareus. Pausanias (8. 53. 10) saw at Tegea *Ἀλέου οἰκίαν καὶ Ἐχέμου μνῆμα καὶ ἐπειργασμένην ἐς στήλην τὴν Ἐχέμου πρὸς τὸν Ὕλλον μάχην*. On Plutarch *Thes.* 32 cp. c. 73 *infra*. Cp. App. Crit.

25. **ἄλλα γέρεα**: Blakesley infers that the Tegeatai had a privileged position in the Spartan symmachy, 'the other wing,' when the forces were purely Peloponnesian, and even in time of peace special privileges in Sparta, to which, rather than to any personal influence, he ascribes the weight of Chileus, c. 9 *supra*.

28. **ἄρχειν** (varied with *ἡγεμονεύειν* above and below) must be doubled for the sense, or *αὐτό* supplied. **ἱκνέεσθαι** with *ἐς* 6. 57, without *ἐς* 2. 36. With the sense cp. also 6. 84 *μᾶλλον τοῦ ἱκνευμένου*.

30. **ἀπηγημένου**: passive, cp. 1. 207.

31. **ἀξιονικότεροι**: cp. 7. 187, c. 27 *infra*.

πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ . . ἀγῶνες ἀγωνίδαται: 1. 66 supplies the commentary on this statement, at least to some extent.

32. **εὖ ἔχοντες** from the speaker's point of view. In praising themselves the Tegeans are on comparatively safe ground; in depreciating the Athenians the speaker 'gives himself away.' The want of tact in this speech is quite primitive, or Pelasgian! These Arkadians (1) remind the Lakedaimonians that the Spartan Hegemony is a comparatively modern invention, (2) glorify themselves for having kept the 'Herakleids' (= Dorians) a century out of the Peloponnesos, (3) remind the Spartans of many

ἀγῶνες ἀγωνίδαται, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους. οὕτω ὦν δίκαιον ἡμέας ἔχειν τὸ ἕτερον κέρας <μᾶλλον> ἤ περ Ἀθηναίους· οὐ γάρ σφι ἐστὶ ἔργα οἷά περ ἡμῖν κατεργασμένα, οὔτ' ὦν καινὰ οὔτε παλαιά."

Οἳ μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεγον, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα ὑπεκρίναντο **27** *τάδε. "ἐπιστάμεθα μὲν σύνοδον τήνδε μάχης εἵνεκα συλλεγῆναι πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον, ἀλλ' οὐ λόγων· ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ Τεγεήτης προέθηκε παλαιὰ καὶ καινὰ λέγειν τὰ ἑκατέροισι ἐν τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ κατέργασται χρηστά, ἀναγκαίως ἡμῖν ἔχει δηλῶσαι πρὸς ὑμέας ὅθεν ἡμῖν πατρώιον ἐστὶ ἐοῦσι χρηστοῖσι αἰεὶ πρώτοισι εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀρκάσι. Ἡρακλείδας, τῶν οὗτοι*

33 *ἀγῶνας* z || *ἄλλους* : *πολλοὺς* **B** 34 *δικαιότερον* Naber appr. van H. : *ἡμέας δίκαιον* z || <*μᾶλλον*> Stein[3] 35 *σφί ἐστι* ABR(SV), Holder, van H. **27.** 2 *σύλλογον τόνδε* Naber 4 <*καὶ*> *παλαιὰ*? Stein, prob. van H. || *καινὰ* : *νέα* S 5 <*καὶ*> *ἡμῖν*? Kallenberg 6 *πατρῶιον ἐστὶ* P : *πατρῶϊον ἐστὶν* Marc. : *πατρῷόν ἐστι* z 7 *μᾶλλον* om. S, Gaisford || *ἢ* <*περ*> Naber || *οὗτοι* post *φασὶ* Pz, om. Marc.

a gallant fight successfully waged against them more recently! After such a speech it is almost an inconsequence to be content with second choice! And then to disparage the Athenians, with Marathon in memory, and the heroism of Olympiodoros under their very eyes (c. 21 *supra*)! But perhaps this last achievement had not taken place when the dispute for precedence arose; the Athenians make no reference thereto.

27. 1. **Ἀθηναῖοι δέ.** The Athenian reply is judicious and tactful, and exhibits many merits (not including modesty) which were conspicuous by their absence in the speech of 'the Tegean.' The Athenian speaker might have been Aristeides (c. 29 *infra*); Plutarch (*Aristeid.* 12) says it was, but puts a different, a shorter and a still more tactful, speech into his mouth, without any Herakleids, Argives, Amazons, or Marathon in it.

2. **σύνοδον . . συλλεγῆναι** : a *σύνοδος* may be a political and formal assembly, a periodic meeting; cp. Thuc. 1. 96, etc. In c. 43 *infra* *Ἑλλήνων σύνοδον* appears to be polemical; here there is a play on both senses.

In the following antithesis *ἔργων* might have been more delicate than **μάχης** and *καὶ οὐ* than **ἀλλ' οὐ.** The Athenian orator is a plain-spoken man. The emphasis placed on *μάχη* is significant. The Athenians are there not to bandy words with the brethren but to do battle with the barbarian. That is the Athenian cue all along; cp. c. 7 *supra*.

5. **ἀναγκαίως . . ἔχει** : cp. 8. 140.

7. **μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀρκάσι** : the meaning is obvious, yet the phrase is ambiguous, added perhaps because without it the Athenian would be advancing a claim even against the Spartan. Taken strictly the phrase leaves the primacy of the Athenians arguable even against the Spartans. The Spartans may, however, treat the question as purely one between Arkadians and Athenians, *ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀρκάσι πατρώιον ἐστὶ πρώτοισι εἶναι*, even though the Athenians, little more than a year before, had been claiming the lead at sea; 8. 3.

Ἡρακλείδας : cp. previous c. The Athenian service to the Herakleids is a service to the ancestors of Pausanias and Euryanax, and to the leaders of the Dorians. 'All Hellenes'—for Hellenes were already Hellenes in those days—drove them out (cp. Diodor. 4. 57, Pausan. 1. 32. 6 etc.). But the speaker can hardly mean to impugn the Hellenism of Athenians or of Herakleids. **ἐς τοὺς ἀπικοίατο** is in any case a saving clause, though, strictly speaking, it covers Athens.

φασὶ ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν ἡγεμόνα ἐν Ἰσθμῷ, τοῦτο μὲν τούτους, πρότερον ἐξελαυνομένους ὑπὸ πάντων Ἑλλήνων ἐς τοὺς ἀπικοίατο φεύγοντες δουλοσύνην πρὸς Μυκηναίων, μοῦνοι ὑποδεξάμενοι τὴν Εὐρυσθέος ὕβριν κατείλομεν, σὺν ἐκείνοισι μάχῃ νικήσαντες τοὺς τότε ἔχοντας Πελοπόννησον. τοῦτο δὲ Ἀργείους τοὺς μετὰ Πολυνείκεος ἐπὶ Θήβας ἐλάσαντας, τελευτήσαντας τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἀτάφους κειμένους, στρατευσάμενοι ἐπὶ τοὺς Καδμείους ἀνελέσθαι τε τοὺς νεκροὺς φαμὲν καὶ θάψαι τῆς

8 ἐν <τῷ> Ἰσθμῷ? Kallenberg || τοῦτο μὲν om. **B**, Holder 9 πάντων τῶν Cz 10 <ἡμεῖς> μοῦνοι? Stein$^{(2)}$ 11 εὐρυσθενέος P : εὐρυσθένεος Sz || κείνοισι z 15 φαμεν τοὺς νεκροὺς S || τῆς om. z

10. **Μυκηναίων**: Eurystheus being lord of Mykenai (cp. Thuc. 1. 9. 2), *τὴν Εὐρυσθέος ὕβριν κατείλομεν*: cp. notes to previous chapter. According to Diodoros *l.c.* Theseus, Hyllos, and Iolaos were in command and Eurystheus fell by the hand of Hyllos; all his sons also perished in the battle. (This would leave Atreus in undisturbed possession of Mykenai.) Iolaos is the son of Iphikles, twin brother to Herakles; cp. Pindar *Pyth.* 11. 60 etc. In *Pyth.* 9. 80 f. it is Iolaos who deals Eurystheus the death-blow.

12. **τοὺς τότε ἔχοντας Π.** leaves the withers of Spartan Dorians unwrung, for *ex hypothesi* they were later comers.

τοῦτο δέ, 'in the second place,' corresponding with *τοῦτο μέν supra*; cp. 7. 6. 5 *supra*.

Ἀργείους τοὺς μετὰ Πολυνείκεος ἐπὶ Θήβας. This expedition (*ἔλασις*) of Polyneikes and the Argives against Thebes is the story of the *Septem contra Thebas* which Aischylos had popularized in 472 B.C. at Athens and Sophokles assumes in the action of the *Antigone*, produced in 440 B.C. (?), in which, however, the heroine anticipates, so far as her brother is concerned, the pious act here ascribed to the Athenians. Amphiaraos was under ground in Boiotia; cp. 8. 134. Tydeus too was duly buried in Thebes according to the *Iliad* 14. 114, which places the event in the generation before the Trojan war, 4. 376 ff. Pindar (*Ol.* 6. 15) erects, indeed, funeral pyres to all the Seven in Thebes. The doctrine that it was the Athenians who performed the last rites for the Argive heroes, and that too by force of arms, supplies the argument to the *Suppliants* of Euripides.

An improved version represented the same end as effected without violence, Plutarch, *Theseus* 29 *συνέπραξε δὲ καὶ Ἀδράστῳ τὴν ἀναίρεσιν τῶν ὑπὸ τῇ Καδμείᾳ πεσόντων, οὐχ ὡς Εὐριπίδης ἐποίησεν ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ μάχῃ τῶν Θηβαίων κρατήσας, ἀλλὰ πείσας καὶ σπεισάμενος· οὕτω γὰρ οἱ πλεῖστοι λέγουσι· Φιλόχορος δὲ καὶ σπονδὰς περὶ νεκρῶν ἀναιρέσεως γενέσθαι πρώτας ἐκείνας.* The rank and file were buried at Eleutherai, the leaders at Eleusis, *ibid.* Aischylos had apparently in his *Eleusinioi* represented Theseus as effecting the arrangement peacefully, *ibid.*, but Pausan. 1. 39. 2 appears to prove Athenian the view here followed by Hdt., while the peaceful solution was a Theban hypothesis; none doubted by that time the burial at Eleusis, where the tombs were on view. These Eleusinian tombs are here referred to, and must be part of the fifth-century argument; they must have been graves of the 'Mykenaian' type and age, such as have been discovered at Eleusis; cp. *Ephemeris Archaiologike*, 1898, pp. 29 ff. It would have been too much to expect the Athenian orator to admit that in the Mykenaian age Eleusis (to say nothing of Eleutherai) was quite independent of Athens. The Athenian claims in regard to the Argive heroes may (I suppose) be regarded as part of the Theseian legend, which was cultivated assiduously in Athens from the days of Peisistratos onwards. The conflict between this passage and the *Antigone*, compared with the notorious agreement between *Ant.* 905 ff. and Hdt. 3. 119, might support the theory of the prior composition of Bks. 7–9, even if the exact date of the production of the *Antigone* is not fully ascertained; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

14. **τὸν αἰῶνα** = *βίον*: cp. 7. 46 *supra*.

15. **Καδμείους**: i.e. the prae-Boiotian inhabitants of Thebes; cp. Thuc. 1. 12. 3,

ἡμετέρης ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι. ἔστι δὲ ἡμῖν ἔργον εὖ ἔχον καὶ ἐς Ἀμαζονίδας τὰς ἀπὸ Θερμώδοντος ποταμοῦ ἐσβαλούσας κοτὲ ἐς γῆν τὴν Ἀττικήν, καὶ ἐν τοῖσι Τρωικοῖσι πόνοισι οὐδαμῶν ἐλειπόμεθα. ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τι προέχει τούτων ἐπιμεμνῆσθαι·

17 ἀμαζίδας **α** || τὰς: τὰς ἀποθήκας τὰς z || θερμόδοντος R 18 ἡρωϊκοῖσι **β** 19 ἐλιπόμεθα **α**: λειπόμεθα **β** || προῦχει τουτέων z

elsewhere by Hdt. (e.g. 5. 57) identified with 'Phoenicians,' and supposed to have been driven out by the Argive *Epigonoi* (cp. 5. 61).

16. **ἔστι δὲ ἡμῖν ἔργον εὖ ἔχον**: the third heroic achievement of the Athenians is their victory over the Amazons who had invaded Attica from the Thermodon. *εὖ ἔχον*, cp. c. 26 *supra*. The connexion of Attica with the Amazon myth, or legend, is post-Homeric, or non-Homeric (*Il.* 3. 184 ff., 6. 186), but is fully established in the fifth century, and like the legend of the Seven incorporated with the Acts of Theseus. Aischylos, *Eumenid.* 655 ff., treats the case as notorious (458 B.C.), and connects the name of the Areiopagos with the Amazonian cult of Ares:

> *πάγον δ' Ἄρειον τόνδ' Ἀμαζόνων ἕδραν*
> *σκηνάς θ' ὅτ' ἦλθον Θησέως κατὰ φθόνον*
> *στρατηλατοῦσαι, καὶ πόλιν νεόπτολιν*
> *τήνδ' ὑψίπυργον ἀντεπύργωσαν τότε,*
> *Ἄρει δ' ἔθυον, ἔνθεν ἔστ' ἐπώνυμος*
> *πέτρα πάγος τ' Ἄρειος.*

Pindar had celebrated the wedding of Theseus and the Amazonian Queen (cp. Plutarch, *Theseus* c. 78; Pausan. 1. 2. 1). The archaeological evidence (ceramic) tends, however, to show that the connexion with Theseus is not really ancient: Herakles, not Theseus, appears on black figured vases with the Amazons, and his place is taken by Theseus on the red figured (cp. Graef *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa, i. 1773, 1777). The growing importance and expansion of the Theseus legend dates from about the middle of the sixth century. Plutarch, *Thes.* 27, shows that the Atthidographers (Hellanikos, Kleidemos, and others) were busy on the subject, as probably the Logographers, Mythographers, before them had been; and the epic of Theseus (*Θησηΐς*, Aristot. *Poet.* 8=1451 A, Plut. *op. c.* 28) was perhaps an earlier work (cp. Bergk, *Gr. Lit.* ii. (1883) 72): the *Amazonis*, or *Amazonia*, ascribed to Homer by Suidas *sub v.* Ὅμηρος, Bergk *l.c.*, perhaps too sceptically, regards as a literary hypothesis (might not the *Amazonia* be a section of the *Theseis*?). The battle of the Amazons was represented in the great fresco by Mikon in the *Poikile Stoa* (cp. Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 678, Pausan. 1. 15. 2), and Pheidias placed the same subject in relief upon the shield of the Virgin (E. Gardner, *Anc. Ath.* 349), and again on the metopes on the west front of her temple (*ibid.* 282).

There is nothing surprising in Hdt., or even an Athenian orator of 479 B.C., taking the story of the Amazonian war for granted. Hdt.'s other story of the Amazons (4. 110–117) involves a war of the Greeks on the Thermodon, and may be connected with the cycle of Herakles-legends at least in the first instance (cp. Pausan. 2. 1. 1): at any rate in this place no hint occurs that the Amazons in Attica were other than the aggressors. The form **Ἀμαζονίδες** here compared with Ἀμάζονες there emphasizes the independence both of the sources and of the composition of the two passages, but leaves the question of priority open. (In the *Proem* 1. 1–4 the war with the Amazons does not rank with the *causes célèbres* of wars between Europe and Asia.)

17. **ἀπὸ Θερμώδοντος ποταμοῦ**: the river here named is the Thermodon by Themiskyra on the Pontos, 4. 86, cp. 2. 104, albeit there was a stream of the same name in Boiotia, near Tanagra; c. 43 *infra*. The Asianic Thermodon, or its neighbourhood, is in all ancient authorities from Aischylos to Ammianus (22. 8. 17) closely associated with the Amazons, though some authorities (e.g. Aischylos, *Prom.* 743 cp. 422) regarded them originally as immigrants thither, while others (e.g. Ammianus) regarded the Thermodon as their birth-place.

18. **ἐν τοῖσι Τρωικοῖσι πόνοισι.** The curtness of this reference to Troy is, indeed, significant. As a matter of fact the remarkable thing is what a poor figure Athens cuts in the Trojan war; cp. 7. 161.

19. **προέχει**: *nihil proficit*, Schweig-

καὶ γὰρ ἂν χρηστοὶ τότε ἐόντες ὡυτοὶ νῦν ἂν εἶεν φλαυρότεροι, καὶ τότε ἐόντες φλαῦροι νῦν ἂν εἶεν ἀμείνονες. παλαιῶν μέν νυν ἔργων ἅλις ἔστω· ἡμῖν δὲ εἰ μηδὲν ἄλλο †ἐστὶ ἀποδεδεγμένον, ὥσπερ ἐστὶ πολλά τε καὶ εὖ ἔχοντα εἰ τεοῖσι καὶ ἄλλοισι Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἔργου ἄξιοι εἰμὲν τοῦτο τὸ γέρας ἔχειν καὶ ἄλλα πρὸς τούτῳ, οἵτινες μοῦνοι Ἑλλήνων δὴ μουνομαχήσαντες τῷ Πέρσῃ καὶ ἔργῳ τοσούτῳ ἐπιχειρήσαντες περιεγενόμεθα καὶ ἐνικήσαμεν ἔθνεα ἓξ τε καὶ τεσσεράκοντα. ἆρ᾽ οὐ δίκαιοι εἰμὲν ἔχειν

---

20 *ἂν* om. *z* || *χρηστοί τε ἐόντες τότε* S || *ὡυτοὶ* C : *ὡὐτοὶ* P*z* : *ἑωυτοὶ* **B** || *φλαυρότερον* R 21 *ἂν εἶεν* repetitum damn. van H. 22 *ἐστὶ* : cf. comment. 23 *ἀποδεδειγμένον z* || *ὥσπέρ ἐστι* ABP 26 an *προμαχήσαντες*? cf. Simonid. Fr. 90 27 <*τε*> *καὶ* van H. 28 *τε* del. van H. || *τεσσαράκοντα* **B**

---

haeuser; *haud praestat,* Stein. Cp. cc. 4, 22 *supra*, etc.

20. **καὶ γὰρ ἂν . . ἀμείνονες**: the sentiment anticipates any criticism based on the obscurity of the Athenian record in the Trojan war. Converted into a maxim by the historian himself it becomes a reason for embracing all cities and societies whether great or small in his review; cp. 1. 5.

22. **εἰ μηδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶ ἀποδεδεγμένον**: *ἐστί* is grammatically impossible and should be *ἦν* or *εἴη* (Stein). With *ἐστί* just below (the source of the *corruptela*?) *subaud. ἀποδεδεγμένα* (brachylogy).

24. **τοῦ ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἔργου.** If this speech were authentic, we should have to admit that ten years had been enough to start the Marathonian legend on a colossal scale: like the infant Herakles it strangles snakes in its cradle. The formula here has three notable points fully developed. (1) The omission of the Plataians from the muster-roll of Marathon, the 'aloneness' of the Athenians in their hour of need: not a very graceful, or probable, touch on the battle-field of Plataia, even if the Spartans could bear to be reminded that they had been conspicuous by their absence at Marathon: *μουνομαχήσαντες τῷ Πέρσῃ* is meant to emphasize the *μοῦνοι*, not to represent the battle as a duel between Athens and the Persian; for 'the Persian' is but one of forty-six nations. *τῷ Μήδῳ* might have been expected here. But cp. App. Crit. (2) The Athenian initiative and forwardness (**ἔργῳ τοσούτῳ ἐπιχειρήσαντες**): the note which grows into the fiction: *πρῶτοι μὲν γὰρ Ἑλλήνων πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν δρόμῳ ἐς πολεμίους ἐχρήσαντο, πρῶτοι δὲ ἀνέσχοντο ἐσθῆτά τε Μηδικὴν ὁρέοντες καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ταύτην ἐσθημένους,* 6. 112. (3) "We defeated six-and-forty nations." The Athenian orator on the field of Plataia in 479 B.C. is already in possession of the army-list of Xerxes 7. 60–80, which enumerates just forty-six *ἔθνεα κατ᾽ ἤπειρον στρατευόμενα.* The first alternative that presents itself is to choose between the authenticity of the speech and that of the list, as a list of what it professes to be: either the speech is not genuine, or the list was made long before 480 B.C. But the list may be made older than 480 B.C. without guaranteeing the authenticity of the speech. Are we in the presence of an Athenian development and gross exaggeration intended to elevate Marathon above Plataia, and the defeat of the army of Dareios under Datis and Artaphrenes at Marathon above the defeat of the army of Xerxes under Mardonios and Artabazos at Plataia? How came Hdt. by such a stroke as this? He certainly did not mean it as a satire upon Athenian braggartness. Had he previously written the story of Marathon, he might have been saved from such an inconsequence: this point supports the hypothesis of the prior composition of Bks. 7–9; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8. This view of Marathon throws Salamis also completely into the shade: that too was a part of the anti-Themistoclean tendency which had long been at work when Hdt. first composed his history of the war.

28. **ἆρα** asks the question with some

ταύτην τὴν τάξιν ἀπὸ τούτου μούνου τοῦ ἔργου; ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε τάξιος εἵνεκα στασιάζειν πρέπει, ἄρτιοι εἰμὲν πείθεσθαι ὑμῖν ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἵνα δοκέει ἐπιτηδεότατον ἡμέας εἶναι ἑστάναι καὶ κατ' οὕστινας· πάντῃ γὰρ τεταγμένοι πειρησόμεθα εἶναι χρηστοί. ἐξηγέεσθε δὲ ὡς πεισομένων."

Οἳ μὲν ταῦτα ἀμείβοντο, Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ ἀνέβωσε ἅπαν τὸ στρατόπεδον Ἀθηναίους ἀξιονικοτέρους εἶναι ἔχειν τὸ κέρας ἤ περ Ἀρκάδας. οὕτω δὴ ἔσχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ ὑπερεβάλοντο τοὺς Τεγεήτας.

Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐτάσσοντο ὧδε οἱ ἐπιφοιτῶντές τε καὶ οἱ **28**

---

29 *μόνον* B**B** 30 *ἄρτι εἴοιμεν* **B** 31 *δοκέῃ* z || *ἐπιτηδεώτατον* CPz, van H. 32 *πάντοι* R 37 *ὑπερεβάλλοντο* SMarc. z 28. 1 *ταῦτα* om. P: del. van H. || *ἐπιφοιτέοντές* Stein[1], van H.

---

surprise and indignation (cp. 7. 17 *supra*): 'is it not right, we should like to know, for us to have this privileged position on the strength of this one achievement even if it stood alone?'—But why is no allusion whatever made to the splendid services of Olympiodoros and his 300 (cc. 21, 22 *supra*)? Is the sequence of events correctly reproduced by Hdt.? Did this dispute succeed that service? Did the Athenians make such a speech as is here put into their mouths? In any case Hdt. can hardly be acquitted of inconsequence.

29. **ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ κτλ.** Who would not be glad to believe that the Athenian spokesman uttered these words, or words to just this effect, instinct with the spirit of loyalty, discipline, practical wisdom, sweet reasonableness, the *εἰωθυῖα πραότης τοῦ δήμου*? Spoken, or unspoken, they represent the better temper which governed the policy and action of Athens during the whole crisis; cp. 7. 145, 8. 3, 79, 144, c. 7 *supra*; but 7. 161 is conceived in a less happy vein, like the earlier passages of this very speech, or the *ultima ratio* in c. 11 *supra*. The end is in better keeping with the practical result. The moral of the previous boast might have been to assign not 'the other wing' but the whole duty of quelling the foe to the Athenians. If they had once already all by themselves defeated the six and forty nations of Asia, why should they not do it again? Why had they worried the Peloponnesians to come to their aid? Why even threatened to make terms with the enemy?

30. **στασιάζειν**: cp. 8. 79.

ἄρτιοι: cp. c. 48 *infra*.

31. **ἵνα**: *ubi*, cp. 8. 115.

33. **ἐξηγέεσθε δὲ ὡς πεισομένων.** The imperative is a little ambiguous: (1) give your interpretation, explanation, decision, verdict; or (2) give your orders, as leaders, cp. cc. 11 *supra*, 66 *infra*.

35. **Λακεδαιμονίων ἀνέβωσε κτλ.** The Lakedaimonians *κρίνουσι* (*sic*) *βοῇ καὶ οὐ ψήφῳ*, Thuc. 1. 87. 2. Blakesley thinks the Spartiates were not sorry to snub the Tegeatai; but this view (*a*) takes the story too much *au pied de la lettre*; (*b*) is hardly consistent with the marked preference shown to the Tegeatai a little later, c. 28 *infra*. Such inconsistencies are frequent in Hdt. and arise from the *insouciance* with which he uses various sources not in complete harmony with one another. The ingenious harmonist might indeed prove his ingenuity on the present case: here *ἅπαν τὸ στρατόπεδον Λακεδαιμονίων* votes the other wing to the Athenians; there *οἱ Σπαρτιῆται*—outvoted on this occasion—take the Tegeatai to themselves—a graceful consolation! Such harmony is worse than silence. Hdt. is unconscious of the dissonance: the Spartiates no more admitted the Perioikoi and Helots to vote in the field than 'between Babyka and Knakion.'

37. **ὑπερεβάλοντο**: cp. 7. 163, 8. 140.

28. 1. **μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐτάσσοντο.** For

ἀρχὴν ἐλθόντες Ἑλλήνων. τὸ μὲν δεξιὸν κέρας εἶχον Λακε-

2 ἀρχὴν ἐθέλοντες B : ἄρχειν ἐθέλοντες Marc. z

reasons above given it is not credible that the Greek forces were ἄτακτοι (6. 93, cp. Thuc. 8. 105. 2—of ships) in the first position. They had reached Erythrai undoubtedly in some order, but necessarily in a marching order (*agmen*). Before descending to the position marked by the Androkrateion and Gargaphia ('second position') the column had presumably extended itself into line by a deployment westwards (cp. c. 25. 4 *supra*), and so developed the 'first position' fully along the ὑπωρέη, from Erythrai past Hysiai into the Plataiis (cp. c. 15 *supra*). In this first position there must have been an order, with a centre (or double centre) and two wings; but whether the Lakedaimonians were as yet on the right or on the left is a disputable problem (cp. c. 21. 1 *supra*).

The words which here follow, in making a distinction between **οἱ ἐπιφοιτῶντες** and **οἱ ἀρχὴν ἐλθόντες** on the Greek side, suggest that in the second position, or just before reaching the second position, the Greeks received considerable reinforcements. It may have been the advent of these reinforcements, in successive contingents (ἐπιφοιτῶντες), that in part emboldened the Greeks to advance to the second position. These reinforcements, or some of them, may have reached the Greek Laager by the direct route from Megara, and may have comprised a large part of the Greek centre. The only divisions of which express mention has been made so far are (1) the Megarians, (2) the Athenians, (3) the Lakedaimonians, (4) the Tegeatai. These are the only ones who figure clearly in the first position, at Erythrai. There are, however, other *motifs* available for the explanation of the advance of the Greeks from the ὑπωρέη to the Asopos-ridge: had the Persian cavalry, on the Dryoskephalai road, nothing to say to it? cp. c. 39 *infra*, and Appendix VIII. § 5 (7).

2. **τὸ μὲν δεξιὸν κέρας**: the right wing consists of 11,500 Hoplites (nominal), viz. 10,000 Lakedaimonians (5000 Spartiatai, 5000 Perioikoi) plus 1500 Tegeatai. To these Hdt. would have us add 40,000 helot ψιλοί (35,000 in attendance on the Spartiates, 7 helots to each citizen, with 5000 more, one for each 'Lakedaimonian'). Stein treats this proportion as the normal levy, and opines that one of the seven was special body-servant (θεράπων) of the Spartiate hoplite, and the six others members of a regiment under the king's command. But (1) where is there any other evidence of such a proportion as the normal one? (2) When were Spartan armies so well supplied with ψιλοί? (3) What record is there of the services of these ψιλοί in the actual fighting? (4) The request of Pausanias for the Athenian τοξόται, c. 60 *infra*—no doubt from a tainted source—still emphasizes the defect of the Spartan contingent in light troops, and exploits it, if you like. (5) The phraseology here does not suggest a closed or organized corps of 20,000–30,000 helot ψιλοί, but a distributive number of 35,000 ψιλοὶ θεράποντες. (6) Politically, the idea of an organization of a helot corps of 30,000 ψιλοί at Sparta is well-nigh inconceivable: such a corps would have effected a revolution! Even Pausanias, in his subsequent tampering with the helots, has not got such a basis as that to work on, or we should have heard of it; cp. Thuc. 1. 132. 4. (7) The normal allowance of θεράποντες appears rather to have been one per hoplite, cp. 7. 229 (and 186): the emphasis which is here laid on the number 7 suggests that it is abnormal. (8) If the numerical figures in the text are to stand, other employment must be found for the huge number of helots, and may be found, as an *Army Service*, engaged in forwarding supplies, cp. c. 39 *infra*. These reasons are sufficient to disprove the fact and figures here; but they leave Hdt. responsible for an egregious blunder. The only rescue for him would be to challenge the text: are the figures corrupt? The *testimonia* carry them back to Plutarch (*Aristeid.* 10) (but neither Diodoros nor Trogus recorded them). This assertion that there were seven helots for every Spartan is made not less than five times in this Book (cc. 10, 28, 29 (*bis*), 61 *implicite*): this very iteration rouses suspicion of the fact, if not of the text. Few critics will be so hardy as to expose a five-fold systematic and consistent *corruptela*!

δαιμονίων μύριοι· τούτων δὲ τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους ἐόντας Σπαρτιήτας ἐφύλασσον ψιλοὶ τῶν εἱλώτων πεντακισχίλιοι καὶ τρισμύριοι, περὶ ἄνδρα ἕκαστον ἑπτὰ τεταγμένοι. προσεχέας δὲ σφίσι εἵλοντο ἑστάναι οἱ Σπαρτιῆται τοὺς Τεγεήτας καὶ τιμῆς εἵνεκα καὶ ἀρετῆς· τούτων δ᾽ ἦσαν ὁπλῖται χίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι. μετὰ δὲ τούτους ἵσταντο Κορινθίων πεντακισχίλιοι, παρὰ δὲ σφίσι εὕροντο παρὰ Παυσανίεω ἑστάναι Ποτειδαιητέων τῶν ἐκ Παλλήνης τοὺς παρεόντας τριηκοσίους. τούτων δὲ ἐχόμενοι ἵσταντο Ἀρκάδες Ὀρχομένιοι ἑξακόσιοι, τούτων

3 *τουτέων* z 4 *εἱλωτέων* **B**z 6 δέ *σφισι* C : δέ *σφι(ν)* ceteri 7 *τουτέων* z || δὲ **B** || *ἔσαν* z 9 δέ *σφισι* **a**Cz : δέ *σφιν* 10, 11, 12 *τουτέων* (ter) z

Otherwise, either *καὶ τρισμύριοι . . τεταγμένοι* might go, or rather, in view of c. 10 *supra*, *πεντακισχίλιοι καὶ τρισ-*, *ἑπτὰ* being reduced to *δύο*, i.e. *ψιλοὶ τῶν εἱλώτων μύριοι, περὶ ἄνδρα ἕκαστον δύο τεταγμένοι.* There may have been 10,000 or 15,000 Helots on the field at Plataia; there will hardly have been 35,000–40,000. The use of **φυλάσσειν** here is remarkable; cp. 6. 75 *ὁ φύλακος, ἦν γὰρ τῶν τις εἱλωτέων* (*sic*), *διδοῖ οἱ μάχαιραν.*

5. **προσεχέας δὲ σφίσι εἵλοντο.** This statement that the Spartiatai chose the Tegeatai to stand next them in line of battle **καὶ τιμῆς εἵνεκα καὶ ἀρετῆς**, to do them honour, and because they were brave men, reads curiously in the light of the last chapter. The two passages, though in immediate juxtaposition, are evidently from wholly different sources. As *σφίσι* refers expressly to *Σπαρτιῆται*, of whom there were but 5000, Hdt. appears to say that the 1500 Tegeatai were posted next the Spartiatai, i.e. between them and the 5000 Perioikoi; but *σφίσι* may perhaps be generalized so as to cover the whole force from Laconia.

8. **μετὰ δὲ τούτους.** Hdt. is reviewing the line (*acies*) from right to left. The contingents from the Korinthian to the Megarian next enumerated, and comprising 18,600 Hoplites, form the centre of the army (= *οἱ πολλοί*, c. 52 *infra*); and this centre is again divided, incidentally, into the right centre, *οἱ ἀμφὶ Κορινθίους*, c. 69 *infra*, comprising 11,300 Hoplites, and the left centre, *οἱ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας τε καὶ Φλειασίους*, *ibid.*, comprising 7300 Hoplites, according to the muster-roll. (To them succeeds the left wing, consisting of the Athenians with the Plataians, 8600 men in all.)

Κορινθίων πεντακισχίλιοι: 5000 Hoplites is an unusually large muster for Korinth. In 435 B.C. Korinth had 3000 Hoplites ready to send to Korkyra, Thuc. 1. 27. 2, but only embarked 2000, *ib.* 29. 1. In 418 B.C. they contributed only 2000 to the great muster at Phleiûs, Thuc. 5. 57. 2. In the battle of Korinth, 394 B.C., 3000 Hoplites from Korinth took part, Xen. *Hell.* 4. 2. 17.

9. **εὕροντο** is used in an unusual sense; cp. c. 26 *supra*.

ἑστάναι is the syncopated perfect infin., cp. 1. 17, Soph. *Ant.* 640, preceded by *τοὺς π. τριηκοσίους.* Pausanias has apparently, at least within certain limits, the right to determine the order of battle, and assign the various contingents their stations. This might square very well with the selection by 'the Spartiates' of the Tegeatai as their next neighbours, less well with the story of the Atheno-Tegeatan dispute.

Ποτειδαιητέων. The Korinthians obtained the grace from Pausanias to have the 300 Poteidaiatai, who were on the spot, to stand, or laager, next them. This is another valiant 300: how they came to be at Plataia is not clear. Poteidaia was, of course, a colony of Korinth's (Thuc. 1. 56. 2), albeit Hdt. nowhere happens to say so. The town has had its own reckoning with the Persian, cp. 8. 126 ff., and how this gallant 300 got to Plataia is far from clear: presumably by sea. The addition of the words *τῶν ἐκ Παλλήνης* (cp. 7. 123) makes it clear what Poteidaia is meant.

11. **ἐχόμενοι**, quasi-geographical rather than military or tactical; cp. 7. 108. 8.

Ἀρκάδες Ὀρχομένιοι ἑξακόσιοι.

δὲ Σικυώνιοι τρισχίλιοι. τούτων δὲ εἴχοντο Ἐπιδαυρίων ὀκτακόσιοι. παρὰ δὲ τούτους Τροιζηνίων ἐτάσσοντο χίλιοι, Τροιζηνίων δὲ ἐχόμενοι Λεπρεητέων διηκόσιοι, τούτων δὲ

---

12 δ' R || *εἴχοντο* del. van H. 13 δὲ om. P || *τούτους . . παρὰ δὲ* om. R 14 *Λεπραιετέων* z 14, 15 *τουτέων* (bis) z

---

The men of Orchomenos are the only other Arkadians, besides the Tegeatai, present on the field, the Mantineians not having arrived in time; cp. c. 77 *infra*. In the previous year *Ἀρκάδες πάντες* had been at the Isthmos under Kleombrotos, 8. 72; and besides Tegeatai, Mantineans, Orchomenians, there had been 1000 Hoplites *ἐκ τῆς λοιπῆς Ἀρκαδίης* in the army of Leonidas, 7. 202. *Ἀρκάδες* is here introduced to distinguish Arkadian Orchomenos from Boiotian; cp. c. 16 *supra*. So in Thucyd. 5. 61. 3 *Ὀρχομενὸν τὸν Ἀρκαδικόν*. (In the Catalogue Boiotian O. is *Μινύειος*, *Il*. 2. 511, Arkadian simply *πολύμηλος*, *ib*. 605.) Six hundred seems a small contingent from the third city of Arkadia: perhaps the tardy exit of the Mantineians kept some of the Orchomenians and other Arkadians at home. It is not clear what the constitution of Orchomenos was at this time. Plutarch *Mor*. 313 cites Theophilos *Πελοποννησιακὰ β'* in a way which might seem to imply that the *βασιλεία* lasted into the Peloponnesian war, but the term *βασιλεύς* is not quite conclusive (cp. 7. 149): the constitution was certainly aristocratic, or oligarchic, in 418 B.C. (cp. Thuc. 5. 61. 4). The name appears as Erchomenos (*Ἐρχομενίων*) on the coinage of the fourth century. Orchomenos asserts, or reasserts, itself in later times; cp. Head, *H.N.* 377 f., and c. 16 *supra*. The only contingent here for which a commander's name is preserved, besides the Spartan, is the Athenian.

12. **Σικυώνιοι τρισχίλιοι.** Sikyon had supplied but 15 ships to the navy-list of Salamis, 8. 43, and had apparently been unrepresented in the army of Leonidas (7. 202), and even in that of Kleombrotos (8. 72); but Sikyonians were serving under Leotychidas, cc. 102, 105 *infra*. Sikyon's contingents are not as a rule numerically specified (cp. Thuc. 5. 57. 2), but in 394 B.C. it sent 1500 Hoplites to the support of Sparta, Xenoph. *Hell*. 4. 2. 16. (The better form of the name is probably *Σεκυών*, cp. Head, *H.N.* 345 ff.)

Ἐπιδαυρίων ὀκτακόσιοι. Epidauros had been unrepresented at Thermopylai (7. 202), but had sent a contingent to the army of Kleombrotos (8. 72) as well as to the fleet under Eurybiades (8. 43), and was probably represented in the fleet of Leotychidas; the men ranked as Dorians, cp. 8. 43.

13. **Τροιζηνίων χίλιοι.** Troizen had sent men to the army under Kleombrotos (8. 72) and a small contingent to the fleet in 480 B.C. (8. 43); in 479 B.C. they were allowed to have distinguished themselves at Mykale, c. 105 *infra*. They, too, now counted as Dorians (8. 43), and in 479 B.C. were presumably, like Korinth, Sikyon, Epidauros, under oligarchic government; but cp. 8. 41 *supra*. (The form of the name is *Τροζάνιοι* on the Plataian monument; cp. coinage, Head, p. 371. *Τροιζήν* appears later, e.g. Dittenberger[1] 372.)

14. **Λεπρεητέων διηκόσιοι.** In 4. 148 Lepreon appears as but one city, or township of an Hexapolis in the west Peloponnesos, of 'Minyan,' or at any rate non-Dorian extraction; cp. 8. 73 *Λημνίων δὲ Παρωρεῆται πάντες*. The *Lepreatis* is the territory of the leading township, but possibly the 200 Hoplites exhibit the levy for the whole district. It was, of course, a bone of contention between Sparta and Elis; cp. Thuc. 5. 31. 2 etc. The occurrence recorded by Hdt. in 4. 148 had presumably not taken place, or was not known to him, when he first drafted Bk. 9, but Ed. Meyer (*G. d. Alterth.* iv. (1901) p. 413) can hardly be right in referring that passage to the same occasion as Thuc. *l.c.* and dating both well into the 'Attic (i.e. Archidamian) war'; Thuc. records merely an Eleian raid into Lepreatis, which is thereupon occupied by a Lakedaimonian garrison; cp. my note *ad l.c.* If Meyer is right that reference would be the latest, or all but the latest, in Hdt.'s work, and would confirm the argument for the priority of Bks. 7–9; in any case, however, it is *prima facie* of later composition than this passage; cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

Μυκηναίων καὶ Τιρυνθίων τετρακόσιοι, τούτων δὲ ἐχόμενοι Φλειάσιοι χίλιοι, παρὰ δὲ τούτους [ἔστησαν] Ἑρμιονέες τριηκόσιοι. Ἑρμιονέων δὲ ἐχόμενοι ἵσταντο Ἐρετριέων τε καὶ

15 ἐχόμενοι del. van H. 16 ἔστησαν B, Stein[1 2] (del. Stein[3]): ἐστησαν A: ἕστησαν C: ἑστασαν (V): ἔστασαν P: ἕστασαν R(S)z 17 τε om. **B**

15. **Μυκηναίων καὶ Τιρυνθίων τετρακόσιοι.** These ancients, a poor remnant of the 'Perseid' and 'Pelopid' ages, might have 'medized' with a better grace than the Dorian Argives. Their hostility to Argos would seal them to the side of Sparta and of Hellas, of which they might fairly consider themselves the oldest representatives. 'Tiryns' here appears for the first time in the war; 'Mykenai' had sent 80 men to Thermopylai, 7. 202, unless, indeed, those and these alike are 'exiles'? It is hard to see how with Argos neutral, or malevolent, Tiryns and Mykenai could have afforded to send their fighting men to Plataia; but cp. c. 12 *supra*. The ruin of Mykenai was still to come or was unknown to Hdt. when he first drafted this passage; cp. 6. 83.

(An *obiter dictum* in J. P. Mahaffy's *Survey of Gk. Civilization*, 1897, p. 31, to which Hall's *Oldest Civilization*, 1901, p. 291, directed my attention, treats these Mykenaians and Tirynthians as 'of course exiles' in view of Mahaffy's theory that the destruction (final?) of Mykenai and Tiryns by Argos 'happened in the eighth or early seventh century B.C.' But the names occur upon the Plataian (and Olympian) monuments, and it is not likely that those lists included 'cityless men.' This observation cuts out my own suggestion up above, that these men were exiles from the still existing Mykenai and Tiryns. Mahaffy's prochronism for the destruction of the two cities appears to be partly mixed up with the view that Perseids and Pelopids 'possessed neither the art of writing nor the art of coining,' plus the complementary view that Mykenaians and Tirynthians of the sixth and fifth centuries would have possessed both. Perhaps they did, even though no specimens have come down to us. As to the Perseids and Pelopids, we now know that they could write, and it is hardly safe to assume that they had no coinage or currency. On the whole I should adhere to the dates given in note *ad l.c.* for the destruction of Tiryns and Mykenai. Meyer, *G. d. Alt.* iii. (1901) p. 516, well remarks that a 'Tirynthian' is victor at Olympia Ol. 78=468 B.C. (Olymp. List in *Oxyrhynchos Papyri*, ii. p. 89): *kurz nachher muss die Zerstörung fallen.*

16. **Φλειάσιοι χίλιοι.** The Chiliad from Phleiûs forms the first section of the left centre, which embraces nine distinct contingents, as against eight in the right centre, but numbers only 7300 men as against 11,300. The right wing and right centre are, if the figures be at all trustworthy, very much stronger than the left centre and left wing (22,800 as compared with 15,900). Men of Phleiûs (200) had served under Leonidas (7. 202) and again at the Isthmos in 480 B.C. (8. 72). Phleiûs was accounted a Dorian city (Pausan. 2. 13. 1 f.), and in the fifth century was anti-Argive and a loyal adherent of Sparta's (cp. Thuc. 4. 70. 1, 133. 3, 5. 57. 2 etc.); hence, perhaps, in part the enthusiasm of Xenophon for the men of Phleiûs, though they were conspicuous by their absence in the battle of Korinth in 394 B.C. (*Hell.* 4. 2. 16); but that is to be explained by inner dissensions at the time. The city is described as one of more than 5000 men in 380 B.C., *ib.* 5. 3. 16.

Ἑρμιονέες τριηκόσιοι: men of Hermion (cp. 8. 73) who were 'Dryopians' (*ib.*) had served under Kleombrotos (*ib.* 72) and furnished a small contingent to the fleet at Salamis, 8. 44. These particular 300 do not distinguish themselves. With this contingent the Peloponnesian portion of the forces comes to an end; but the divisions in the army do not follow strictly geographical order, and the two last Peloponnesian items act with the left centre and left wing, which is otherwise all drawn from exo-Peloponnesian states.

17. **Ἐρετριέων τε καὶ Στυρέων ἑξακόσιοι.** Eretria had sent seven and Styra two ships to the fleet at Salamis, 8. 46. The Eretrians were 'Ionians' (*ib.*), and as

Στυρέων ἑξακόσιοι, τούτων δὲ Χαλκιδέες τετρακόσιοι, τούτων δὲ Ἀμπρακιητέων πεντακόσιοι, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Λευκαδίων καὶ Ἀνακτορίων ὀκτακόσιοι [ἔστησαν], τούτων δὲ ἐχόμενοι Παλέες οἱ ἐκ Κεφαλληνίης διηκόσιοι. μετὰ δὲ τούτους Αἰγινη-

18 *τουτέων* (bis) z || *τούτων . . τετρακόσιοι* om. **B** 19 *ἀμπρακιωτέων* **B**, Holder 20 *έστησαν* **a**: *ἔστησαν* C*d*: *έστασαν* (V): *ἕστασαν* P: *ἕστασαν* R(S)z: del. Stein³ || *τουτέων* z || *δὲ ἐχόμενοι* z: *δὲ ἐχόμενοι ἵσταντο* Marc.

such are one of the two Ionian contingents in the army (excluding the Athenians); Styra was 'Dryopian' (*ib.*): so this third division in the left centre might have been expected to stand well beside the second. The names here are perhaps given in the order of their importance; the Dryopians may have stood next to each other (Styreans and Hermionians), and so too the Ionians from Eretria and Chalkis.

18. **Χαλκιδέες τετρακόσιοι**: the men of Chalkis had supplied, or rather manned, twenty ships in 480 B.C. (8. 1, 46). At the rate allowed by Hdt. for *Epibatai* that might run to 600 men; but some may have been serving under Leotychidas, or they may have suffered in the war. These men of Chalkis must be natives, not Athenian kleruchs, who, if serving in the army, would surely be with the citizens, on the left wing, either as a distinct corps, or fighting each man in the ranks of his own tribe (*φυλή*); cp. provision in the Salaminian case: [*παρὰ δὲ Ἀθηναίοι*]*σι τε*[*λ*]*εῖν καὶ στρατ*[*εύεσθ*]*αι*, Hicks' *Manual*² No. 4. (It is rather difficult to believe that *kleruchs* accustomed to act together as a garrison *in loco* would be distributed among the phylic regiments on the battle-field. If the 'Chalkidians' here were Athenian kleruchs they would amount to $\frac{1}{20}$ of the nominal total of the Attic force.)

19. **Ἀμπρακιητέων πεντακόσιοι.** The contingent is a considerable one, as coming *ἐξ ἐσχατέων χωρέων*, cp. 8. 47, and with the next might be put down in part to the credit of Korinth, of which Amprakia, Leukas, Anaktorion were colonies; cp. 8. 45. It is the more remarkable that these two contingents (V., VI. in the left centre) are not favoured like the Poteidaiatai above, but placed among the outsiders.

Λευκαδίων καὶ Ἀνακτορίων ὀκτακόσιοι: probably the contingent from each state was not equal, but that from Leukas the larger, or they would have been separately enumerated. The combination may represent a section, or division, under one command. For Leukas cp. 8. 45, 47 and c. 38 *infra*. Anaktorion, not elsewhere mentioned by Hdt. (except c. 31 *infra*), was a joint foundation from Korkyra and Korinth at the mouth of the Amprakian Gulf (cp. Thuc. 1. 55. 1), and a considerable bone of contention in the first period of the Peloponnesian war (of which there is no hint here).

21. **Παλέες οἱ ἐκ Κεφαλληνίης διηκόσιοι.** Kephallenia is not elsewhere mentioned by Hdt. Thucydides 2. 30. 2 makes its position clear: *κεῖται δὲ ἡ Κεφαλληνία κατὰ Ἀκαρνανίαν καὶ Λευκάδα τετράπολις οὖσα, Παλῆς, Κράνιοι, Σαμαῖοι, Προνναῖοι.* Paleis was obviously the most important member of the Tetrapolis (cp. Thuc. 1. 27. 2), but were the 200 men here mentioned all from the one township? Kephallenia was annexed by Athens in 431 B.C. (Thuc. *l.c.*), a fact which Hdt. was in no way bound to notice, but of which anyway he shows no consciousness.

It is Stein's suggestion that Hdt. read ΠΑΛΕΕΣ instead of FΑΛΕΙΟΙ on the inscription at Olympia, described by Pausanias 5. 23. 1, as the name of the Eleians is given by Pausanias and that of the Paleis is not given. This is simply an inversion of the old suggestion of P. O. Broendsted (Bursian, *G. d. class. Philol.* 1048; cp. Grote, iv. 256 n. and Rawlinson iv.³ 395, each spelling the name differently, and both wrongly) that Pausanias read FΑΛΕΙΟΙ for ΠΑΛΕΕΣ. The old suggestion is much the better of the two. In Hdt.'s time the inscription was new and clear; in the time of Pausanias it was 600 years old. The name of the Eleians was to be expected, especially at Olympia, rather than that of the small Kephallenian township. Grote adds that the Eleians

τέων πεντακόσιοι [ἐτάχθησαν]. παρὰ δὲ τούτους ἐτάσσοντο Μεγαρέων τρισχίλιοι. εἴχοντο δὲ τούτων Πλαταιέες ἑξακόσιοι. τελευταῖοι δὲ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἀθηναῖοι ἐτάσσοντο, κέρας ἔχοντες τὸ εὐώνυμον, ὀκτακισχίλιοι· ἐστρατήγεε δ' αὐτῶν Ἀριστείδης

22 πεντηκόσιοι **a**C || ἐτάχθησαν secl. Stein[3] || ἐτάσσοντο secl. van H. 23 τουτέων *z* 25 δὲ **B** || αὐτέων *z*

might have altered the name, and that Plutarch *de m. Hdti*=*Mor.* 873 seems to have read the same inscription as Pausanias.

It remains, however, still to be proved that Hdt. had read the inscription at Olympia before writing down this list. Doubtless an official document of some kind underlies the list here, but it need not have been the precise inscription at Olympia, nor again need Hdt. have copied that document himself. The list of Hdt. differs from the list of Pausanias not merely by the point above specified, but in others: Pausanias omits Eretrians and Leukadians, and inserts five names from the Nesiote region. Again, Hdt. gives the numbers of the contingents, which were certainly not on the inscription. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that Hdt. compiled his army-list for Plataia at Olympia; it is even less likely than that he compiled his navy-list for Salamis at Delphi (cp. 8. 82). The army-list was probably part of the original draft of the work, not an addition; cp. further, Introduction, § 10.

Αἰγινητέων πεντακόσιοι: the contingent is not large for Aigina, a state which had held its own, and something more, in the recent war with Athens (cp. 7. 145); but the Aiginetans were no doubt serving on the fleet, and in any case the island would not have put a large force on the mainland.

23. **Μεγαρέων τρισχίλιοι**: the 3000 Megarians (a contingent six times as large as the Aiginetan) had already given a good account of themselves c. 21 *supra*; and besides this goodly contingent, *ἐν παιδίῳ Βοιωτίῳ οἵτινες ἔτλαν χεῖρας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἱππομάχους ἱένε*: there were, if we may trust the same epigram, Megarians at Mykale (cp. Hicks' *Manual*[2] No. 17, where the services of the Megarians against the cavalry are erroneously restricted to their disaster, c. 69 *infra*). Like the Aiginetans (8. 46) the Megarians were Dorians; cp. 5. 76.

Πλαταιέες ἑξακόσιοι. The Plataians would certainly have put every man they could into the field. The traditional number of the Plataians at Marathon is 1000 (cp. Hdt. IV.–VI. ii. 204, 206); fifty years after 479 B.C. they are minished to 400, Thuc. 2. 78. 3. Hdt. might here seem to class them with the Megarians as belonging to the left centre; but the title of that section in c. 69 *infra* and the probabilities of the case alike point to the Plataian contingent being reckoned, with the Athenian, on the left wing. Was there none on the right? Cp. c. 72 *infra*.

24. **τελευταῖοι δὲ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἀθηναῖοι**, 'last,' in reckoning from the right wing, all along the line to the left; but 'first' as the army moved westwards, or forwards; or head of the column, which had moved to Erythrai, and then out on to the ὑπωρέῃ, before descending into the second position. This assertion of the πρωτεῖον of the Athenians comes from an Atticizing source, and would hardly have been emphasized at the Spartan headquarters; the double description τελευταῖοι . . πρῶτοι prepares the way for the *chassé* in c. 46 below, by which the last become first and the first last! 8000 Hoplites, besides some light-armed troops, is a large contingent, especially considering the contemporary service of the fleet, in which the Athenians were doubtless more largely represented than any other single state (cp. 8. 131); but the figure is not incredibly large for Athens, even in 479 B.C. requiring about 800 men to each phylic regiment, or τάξις. Cp. the estimate for 431 B.C. in Thuc. 2. 13. No doubt all ten tribes were represented in the field; and there may have been 2000 Athenian Hoplites at Mykale, or nearly so ($50 \times 30 = 1500$), as well.

25. **Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου**: cp. 8. 79. The occurrence of this name here, with the patronymic, suggests that the nomination of this sole Strategos was an integral part of the document, or the source, from which Hdt. drew his list, and also that the source was an 'Atticizing' one. Aristeides is the

29 ὁ Λυσιμάχου. οὗτοι, πλὴν τῶν ἑπτὰ περὶ ἕκαστον τεταγμένων Σπαρτιήτῃσι, ἦσαν ὁπλῖται, σύμπαντες ἐόντες ἀριθμὸν τρεῖς τε μυριάδες καὶ ὀκτὼ χιλιάδες καὶ ἑκατοντάδες ἑπτά. ὁπλῖται μὲν οἱ πάντες συλλεγέντες ἐπὶ τὸν βάρβαρον ἦσαν τοσοῦτοι, ψιλῶν δὲ πλῆθος ἦν τόδε, τῆς μὲν Σπαρτιητικῆς τάξιος πεντακισχίλιοι καὶ τρισμύριοι ἄνδρες, ὡς ἐόντων ἑπτὰ περὶ ἕκαστον ἄνδρα, καὶ τούτων πᾶς τις παρήρτητο ὡς ἐς πόλεμον· οἱ δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων ψιλοί, ὡς εἷς περὶ ἕκαστον ἐὼν ἄνδρα, πεντακόσιοι καὶ τετρακισχίλιοι καὶ

30 τρισμύριοι ἦσαν. ψιλῶν μὲν δὴ τῶν ἁπάντων <τῶν> μαχίμων ἦν τὸ πλῆθος ἕξ τε μυριάδες καὶ ἐννέα χιλιάδες καὶ ἑκατον-

---

29. 2 ἔσαν z || συνάπαντες **B**, Holder, van H. || τρίς **B** 3 τε om. z || χειλιάδες van H. 4 ἔσαν z 6 ὡς . . ἄνδρα del. Kallenberg 7 τουτέων z 10 ἔσαν z 30. 1 τῶν suppl. Stein 2 καὶ ἐννέα χιλιάδες om. **B** || χειλιάδες van H.

---

only general named: the captains or leaders of all the contingents would have been included in a document framed at headquarters. If the name were introduced as a bit of free narrative by Hdt. it might have been expected above, in c. 21, when the service of Olympiodoros must have been mediated through the Strategos, or in c. 27, where the Strategos was presumably the spokesman, or else reserved for c. 44 *infra*, where the Strategos appears in action. If Aristeides alone is named it is presumably because he was Strategos ἡγεμών if not αὐτοκράτωρ, and had a constitutional and permanent lead: the whole college of Strategoi was not present; cp. 8. 131, and Appendix VII. § 4.

29. 1. **πλὴν τῶν ἑπτά**: this notice of the 35,000 Helots, who reappear almost immediately below, is necessitated by their having been introduced in c. 28 above, where they have been expressly described as ψιλοί. The object of this chapter is to estimate the sum total of Hoplites and ψιλοί. The sum total for the Hoplites is correct, i.e. corresponds to the items, which amount to 38,700.

5. **ψιλῶν δέ.** Hdt. has made a mistake apparently in his estimate of the light-armed, which he over-estimates by 800 on his own showing. This apparent error may have arisen from his having got totals, not from the addition of his items, but as *data*, in themselves correct. The 800 *de trop* may in short represent an item omitted in his estimate of details. The narrative in the context suggests such an omission, for unless the highly-trained Athenian τοξόται of cc. 22, 60, above and below, are included in the general total of ψιλοί ὡς εἷς περὶ ἕκαστον ἐὼν ἄνδρα, they are omitted. The addition of an allowance of 800 for these Archers makes Hdt.'s totals correct, i.e. agree with the items (A. G. Laird, *Notes on Herodotus*, 1904).

7. **τούτων πᾶς τις παρήρτητο** (pl.p.) **ὡς ἐς πόλεμον.** Yet of this huge mass of light infantry not a single solitary shot is recorded; and in the hour of need the Spartans send to borrow the Athenian Archers!

8. **τῶν λοιπῶν** = 33,700 (i.e. 38,700 − 5000 Spartiates). 33,700 + 800 = 34,500, which is the total given by Hdt. for the ψιλοί other than the 35,000, seven per each Spartiate. This includes 5000 Helots for the 5000 Lakedaimonian Hoplites. The allowance of one ψιλός per Hoplite is no doubt the normal Greek average: what is remarkable here is that Hdt. treats all these θεράποντες as μάχιμοι, and even more emphatically the 35,000 Helots as all equipped for war.

30. 2. **ἕξ τε . . πέντε**: 69,500 is an excess of 800 over the items in Hdt.'s calculation, as just shown, and the 800 may be the figure for the Athenian τοξόται, cp. last c. Granting his total for the ψιλοί the addition of 38,700 Hoplites gives a grand total of 108,200 men, or, as Hdt. phrases it, Eleven myriads less one thousand eight hundred men. The

τάδες πέντε, τοῦ δὲ σύμπαντος τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ τοῦ συνελθόντος ἐς Πλαταιὰς σύν τε ὁπλίτῃσι καὶ ψιλοῖσι τοῖσι μαχίμοισι ἕνδεκα μυριάδες ἦσαν, μιῆς χιλιάδος, πρὸς δὲ ὀκτακοσίων ἀνδρῶν καταδέουσαι. σὺν δὲ Θεσπιέων τοῖσι παρεοῦσι ἐξεπληροῦντο αἱ ἕνδεκα μυριάδες· παρῆσαν γὰρ καὶ Θεσπιέων ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ οἱ περιεόντες, ἀριθμὸν ἐς ὀκτακοσίους καὶ χιλίους· ὅπλα δὲ οὐδ᾽ οὗτοι εἶχον. οὗτοι μέν νυν ταχθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο.

Οἱ *δὲ ἀμφὶ Μαρδόνιον βάρβαροι ὡς ἀπεκήδευσαν* **31** *Μασίστιον, παρῆσαν, πυθόμενοι τοὺς Ἕλληνας εἶναι ἐν Πλαταιῇσι, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀσωπὸν τὸν ταύτῃ ῥέοντα.*

---

3 *σύμπαντος στρατοῦ*? Stein: *τοῦ* ante *Ἑλληνικοῦ* om. **ß**, Holder, van H. 4 *ὁπλίτοισι* S 5 *ἔσαν* z: del. van H. 6 *ἀνδρῶν* om. **ß** 8 *ἐς* om. RS 9 *οὐδ᾽*: *οὐκ* C 10 *ἐστρατεύοντο* S
31. 1 *δ᾽* CPz || *ἀμφὶ περὶ* C 3 *πλαταίῃσι* **ß** || *τὸν ταύτῃ ῥέοντα* suspect. habet Kallenberg

---

full 110,000 was just made up by 1800 Thespians, all that survived of that city, but they were without arms.

There would be little or no sense in Hdt.'s adding the 1800 Thespians to the sum total of *μάχιμοι* unless they had served at least as *ψιλοί* (raising the total of that branch to 71,300 as against 38,700 Heavies). Panoplies might, however, have been found for them, from the men slain and wounded in the course of the fighting in Boiotia; but perhaps no Greek state would find panoplies for another.

Thespiai had lost 700 men at Thermopylai, 7. 222; the city had been subsequently destroyed, the population having fled into the Peloponnesos, 8. 50. Are we to understand that except for these disasters Thespiai might have put 2500 Hoplites into the field at Plataia?

On the subsequent restoration of Thespiai cp. 8. 75.

10. **ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ**: this phrase is of importance. The second position, as described in c. 25 *supra* *πλησίον τῆς τε κρήνης τῆς Γαργαφίης καὶ τοῦ τεμένεος τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτεος*, is here described as 'on the Asopos.' The river could at least be seen from the Laager (which would not be the case from the first position); in other words, the Laager was on the ridge north of Gargaphia, sloping down to the river; but of course the Greeks could not water from the Asopos proper. G. B. Grundy, *G.P.W.* pp. 470 f., argues that by 'Asopos' in this passage is to be understood not the main stream (north of the position) but one of its tributaries, A^1, "the brook which has its rise in the springs of Apotripi." The point is neat, but does not (*me iudice*) make any substantial difference in our conception of the Greek position. That position is marked by the Androkrateion, Gargaphia, and the Asopos; i.e. it was south of the main stream, and east of A^1; but there is no need to infer that by the Asopos here Hdt. definitely means A^1. He more probably means the main stream in front; the river is near enough to define the position: they had been *ἐπὶ τῇ ὑπωρέῃ*, they are now *ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ*. Cp. next c.

31. 1. **ἀμφί**: cp. c. 69 *infra*; or for a more exact parallel 8. 25 *οἱ ἀμφὶ Ξέρξην*, 'Xerxes and his men.'

ἀπεκήδευσαν, 'were done with mourning,' cp. 2. 40 *ἀποτύψωνται*, 2. 73 *ἀποπειρηθῇ*, cp. Thuc. 2. 61. 4 *ἀπαλγήσαντας δὲ τὰ ἴδια*.

2. **ἐν Πλαταιῇσι**: sc. *ἐν τῷ χώρῳ τῷ Πλαταιικῷ*, cp. c. 25 *supra*; in Plataia, as the city itself had been destroyed, cp. 8. 50, they could not be.

3. **τὸν Ἀσωπὸν τὸν ταύτῃ ῥέοντα**: this expression is a remarkable one, coming as it does after the Asopos has just been mentioned without qualification (c. 30), and after the Persian encampment has been described as *παρὰ τὸν Ἀσωπὸν ποταμὸν τεταγμένον* c. 15 *supra*. Is *τὸν*

ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἀντετάσσοντο ὧδε ὑπὸ Μαρδονίου. κατὰ μὲν Λακεδαιμονίους ἔστησε Πέρσας. καὶ δὴ πολλὸν γὰρ περιῆσαν

4 *ἐτάσσοντο* B || *ὧιδε* P 5 *περιῆσαν* Matthiae : *περίεσαν* **a**Cz : *περιέασαν* **B**, Gaisford

ταύτῃ ῥέοντα merely a periphrasis for *ποταμόν*? But why then *ταύτῃ*? And why *ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ simpliciter*, in c. 30? Is it that the various passages are from various sources, and that Hdt. does not very strictly co-ordinate them? That may be so, yet hardly explains the introduction of *τὸν ταύτῃ ῥέοντα*. The locative adverb is strictly relative to *ἐν Πλαταιῇσι*, and seems to imply that the Persian moved from the Asopos, where it was not *ἐν Πλ.*, to the Asopos where it was. But, even so, a difficulty is left, as the Laager is described in c. 15 *supra* as reaching *ἐς τὴν Πλαταιίδα γῆν*. That is, however, the Laager: here he is speaking of the line of battle. We must suppose that Mardonios moves out of his camp into battle-line, formed up along the higher course of the Asopos. It is clear in the sequel that the Persians are on the left bank of the river. Is Mardonios aiming to circumvent the Greek position by turning its left flank, or simply offering battle if they will cross the river?

G. B. Grundy, *G.P.W.* p. 470, cp. *Topography* p. 19, suggests that the phrase here in question denotes the main stream of the Asopos, or even 'the Thespian Asopos,' as distinguished from the Plataian Asopos, though he clearly sees that *ταύτῃ* refers to *ἐν Πλαταιῇσι*. If anything but the main stream were here meant, it would be, not the branch from Leuktra, but the branch from Plataia, i.e. A^1. But the contrast is not between two branches of the river, but between the main stream, in the neighbourhood of the Persian camp, and the same main stream a little higher up, in the neighbourhood of the Greek position.

Stein, who leaves the Persians and the Persian camp on the right bank of the river all this time, thinks there must be a lacuna in the narrative. No doubt there are many gaps in the narrative, and many omissions, but Hdt. has duly taken the Persians across the Asopos long ago (c. 15 *supra*), and Mardonios has not had to cross the river in order to take up the position here described.

We may, perhaps, paraphrase the phrase *τὸν Ἀσωπὸν τὸν ταύτῃ ῥέοντα*, 'the Asopos, in this part of its course,' i.e. where it flows through the land of Plataia: emphasis is perhaps laid on the *ῥέοντα* to show that there was water in the river-bed.

4. **ἀντετάσσοντο ὧδε ὑπὸ Μαρδονίου.** This account of Mardonios' battle-array may be in part at least drawn from a source (or sources) on the Persian side; for example, Hdt.'s friend from Orchomenos (c. 16 *supra*); but it is hardly based on authoritative and documentary sources, or it would be fuller and more precise in regard to numbers, names of commanders, and so forth: more, in fact, like the army-list in Bk. 7. Mardonios' men are arranged in five ethnic divisions, Persians, Medes, Baktrians, Indians, Sakians (the medized Greeks not included). If each of these divisions represents a myriad, he had 50,000 men under his command (with perhaps an additional myriad (?) of cavalry); if two myriads, 100,000; or with the army corps of Artabazos, approximately 150,000: further it is hardly necessary to go. The infantry and cavalry are not distinguished from each other in the description here given. The cavalry might have been all in front of the infantry (as at the battle of the Granikos in 334 B.C.) or on the wings; it can scarcely have been in the rear, much less mixed up with the infantry. As the Persian forces all freely crossed the river, the cavalry was probably on the wings; and further, the Persian cavalry was now on the left, and the Boiotio-Thessalian on the right. Hdt. describes the divisions of the Persian army with reference to the ethnic divisions on the Greek side, already enumerated, but with the remarkable result of suggesting a somewhat different ordering of the two wings and the centre, especially of the centre and the left wing, the whole Greek army now falling, like the Persian, into six corps, four in the centre, two on the wings, and the constituent items of these corps—except in the case of the right wing—being varied as against the previous army-list. This slight inconsequence again points to a difference in the sources for the two army-lists at Plataia.

5. **Πέρσας**: the 'Persians' properly

πλήθεϊ οἱ Πέρσαι, ἐπί τε τάξις πλεῦνας ἐκεκοσμέατο καὶ ἐπεῖχον τοὺς Τεγεήτας. ἔταξε δὲ οὕτω· ὅ τι μὲν ἦν αὐτῶν δυνατώτατον πᾶν ἀπολέξας ἔστησε ἀντίον Λακεδαιμονίων, τὸ δὲ ἀσθενέστερον παρέταξε κατὰ τοὺς Τεγεήτας. ταῦτα δ' ἐποίεε φραζόντων τε καὶ διδασκόντων Θηβαίων. Περσέων δὲ ἐχομένους ἔταξε Μήδους· οὗτοι δὲ ἐπέσχον Κορινθίους τε καὶ Ποτιδαιήτας καὶ Ὀρχομενίους τε καὶ Σικυωνίους. Μήδων δὲ ἐχομένους ἔταξε Βακτρίους· οὗτοι δὲ ἐπέσχον Ἐπιδαυρίους τε

6 οἱ om. Pz || ἐπεὶ **B** || τάξεις C 7 καὶ τοὺς **B**, Holder, van H. || οὕτως R || αὐτῶν de Pauw, Stein², Holder, van H.: αὐτοῦ 9 δ': δὲ **B**

so called are stationed over against the Lakedaimonians, who, reckoning only Hoplites, counted *ex hypothesi* one myriad. There are besides 40,000 ψιλοί, whose exact station on the battle-field is not clearly defined. Greatly to outnumber these 50,000 the Persians must have exceeded a fifth of the whole forces of Mardonios. (That in itself is not impossible!) If only Hoplites are considered, a myriad Persians, or at most two, would serve. If the cavalry is on the extreme left, Persian footmen might easily out-flank a myriad Lakedaimonians, drawn up not less than eight deep, and possibly deeper; but Hdt., starting, of course, with a belief in the immense numerical superiority on the side of Mardonios, not only makes the 'Persians' overlap the Tegeatai, but gives them an extra deep formation.

6. **ἐπί τε τάξις πλεῦνας ἐκεκοσμέατο**: the pluperfect has hardly a strict temporal force, at least from the point of view of the objective course of events. πλεῦνας means not more than the Lakedaimonians but 'more than he would otherwise have done,' or 'than was usual.' At Marathon, where the Athenians, according to Hdt., formed up for battle after the Persians, in order to draw out a line as long as the Persian, Kallimachos had to diminish his centre ἐπὶ τάξιας (*sic*) ὀλίγας 6. 111. In the present case Mardonios is represented as drawing up in battle-array after the Greeks, but he has no apparent desire to out-flank them, so having men to spare he deepens his ranks. Oddly enough, the order was the same on the Greek side: the wings are much stronger, and probably much deeper than the centre; the tactics of Marathon were repeated—or the legend of Marathon was composed in the light of Plataia.

7. **ἐπεῖχον τοὺς Τεγεήτας**: Schweighaeuser (with whom Sitzler agrees) takes this phrase to mean, they had the Tegeatai "stationed over against them" (*gegenüberstehen*), and inserts a καί, but cp. κατά just above; Stein appears to be correct in rendering the phrase: 'extended so as to cover the Tegeatai'—who, no doubt, as a matter of fact are stationed opposite (κατέχουσι); in other words, the part left over (τὸ ὑπέρεχον), after the Lakedaimonians are fully covered, covers the Tegeatai. Cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 2. 21. The Lakedaimonian and Tegeatan Hoplites, taken together, form the right (east) wing of the Greek army, 11,500 strong. This passage looks as though the Tegeatai were not standing next the Spartiatai but next the Perioikoi, cp. c. 28 *supra*, but the words which follow here are not magisterial, but a homage to the reputation of Lakedaimonians, Spartiatai included: the Theban dictation, or inspiration, is perhaps only inferential.

11. **Μήδους**: the Medes (one, or two myriads?) are opposed to and co-extensive with Korinthians, Poteidaians, Orchomenians, Sikyonians, that is with the first four divisions, right centre, of the Greek line, numbering 8900 Hoplites.

13. **Βακτρίους**. The Baktrian division (including, perhaps, other Iranians, and numbering one, or possibly two 'myriads'!) has opposite to it, and extends over, the right middle centre of the Greeks, and somewhat more; the Epidaurians, Troizenians, Lepreatai and Mykeno-Tirynthian contingents taken together comprise but 2400 Hoplites, and with the Tirynthians we reach what afterwards appears as the end of the right centre (c. 69 οἱ ἀμφὶ Κορινθίους): the addition of the Phleiasians here, 1000 strong, raises the opponents of the Baktrian myriad to 3400, but encroaches

καὶ Τροιζηνίους καὶ Λεπρεήτας τε καὶ Τιρυνθίους καὶ Μυκηναίους τε καὶ Φλειασίους. μετὰ δὲ Βακτρίους ἔστησε Ἰνδούς· οὗτοι δὲ ἐπέσχον Ἑρμιονέας τε καὶ Ἐρετριέας καὶ Στυρέας τε καὶ Χαλκιδέας. Ἰνδῶν δὲ ἐχομένους Σάκας ἔταξε, οἳ ἐπέσχον Ἀμπρακιήτας τε καὶ Ἀνακτορίους καὶ Λευκαδίους καὶ Παλέας καὶ Αἰγινήτας. Σακέων δὲ ἐχομένους ἔταξε ἀντία Ἀθηναίων τε καὶ Πλαταιέων καὶ Μεγαρέων Βοιωτούς τε καὶ

14 λεπριήτας **α** : λεπρηίτας Marc. : Λεπραιήτας z || τε om. **α** || τυρινθίους B[1] 15 φλιασίους **β**, Stein[1], Holder 18 ἀμβρακιώτας **β**, Holder || λευκαδίους τε καὶ **β** 19 παλαίας B : παλλέας Marc. || ἀντίον **β**

on the first section of the left centre of c. 69.

16. **Ἰνδούς**: the contingent of the furthest east was opposed to the Greek contingents from Hermion, Eretria, Styra, Chalkis, a group numbering but 1300 Hoplites. If the 'Indian' levy was reckoned at a myriad, it would hugely outnumber the force immediately opposed to it here.

17. **Σάκας**: the Sakai or 'Scyths of Asia' (cp. 7. 64) are drawn up over against five Greek ethnic divisions, Amprakiotes, Anaktorians, Leukadians, Paleis, Aiginetans, numbering all told but 2000 Hoplites. The division on the Persian side represents perhaps a 'myriad'—not necessarily all composed of Sakai, properly so called! These five Greek sections carry us to the extreme left of the centre, as conceived in c. 28 above, and more certainly in c. 69 below (*οἱ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας τε καὶ Φλειασίους*), except that in the list here given the Phleiasians have been attached to the right centre, and the Megarians are now divorced from the centre altogether, and apparently reckoned to the left wing. Such inconsistencies imply that Hdt. has used various 'Sources,' without comparing or co-ordinating them, and has no one clear and consistent conception of the battle-array.

19. **ἀντία Ἀθηναίων τε κτλ.**: cp. *ἀντίον Λακεδαιμονίων* above. The variation from *κατά* to *ἀντία* is noticeable and emphatic; the neuter (s. and pl.) of the adj. is used adverbially, or as a preposition, cp. 7. 209; also with the dative, 7. 236. This use is not Attic. The plural form is here perhaps preferred, as the corps opposed to the Athenians was composed of a number of Greek contingents. The order of the names on the Greek side too is here varied; proceeding consistently from Mardonios' left to right they would run, Megarians, Plataians, Athenians. Again, the formula is further varied by introducing the names on the Greek side before the name, or names, on the Persian. Among other results, the exact order in which the various sections of Greeks on the Persian side stood opposed to the left wing of the Greeks, including the Megarians, remains problematic.

20. **Βοιωτούς τε κτλ.** : the extreme right of Mardonios' line, his right wing in fact, is composed of medizing Greeks, to wit, Boiotians, Lokrians, Melians, Thessalians and Phokians, 1000 strong, the only figure given for an individual contingent. Hdt. below estimates the total of this sixth division at 50,000, an absurd exaggeration, suggested to him perhaps by the assumption that each of the six divisions, like the division of Artabazos, which is not here brought into line, consisted approximately of 50,000 men. That would involve an average twelve thousand each for Boiotia, Lokris, Malis, Thessaly! The Boiotians might have brought 5000–6000 Hoplites (cp. Thuc. 5. 57. 2, Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 2. 17); the Thessalians will have been chiefly mounted men; the Lokrians and Malians may have raised 1500–2000 Hoplites between them: all told, the Greek Hoplites on the Persian right wing will not have numbered more than one myriad, and they are here opposed to the Athenians, Plataians and Megarians, who number together 11,600 men. But there are the Thessalian and

Λοκροὺς καὶ Μηλιέας τε καὶ Θεσσαλοὺς καὶ Φωκέων τοὺς χιλίους· οὐ γὰρ ὦν ἅπαντες οἱ Φωκέες ἐμήδισαν, ἀλλά τινες αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ Ἑλλήνων ηὖξον περὶ τὸν Παρνησσὸν κατειλημένοι, καὶ ἐνθεῦτεν ὁρμώμενοι ἔφερόν τε καὶ ἦγον τήν τε Μαρδονίου στρατιὴν καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐόντας Ἑλλήνων. ἔταξε δὲ καὶ Μακεδόνας τε καὶ τοὺς περὶ Θεσσαλίην οἰκημένους κατὰ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. ταῦτα μὲν τῶν ἐθνέων τὰ **32**
μέγιστα ὠνόμασται τῶν ὑπὸ Μαρδονίου ταχθέντων, τά περ ἐπιφανέστατά τε ἦν καὶ λόγου πλείστου· ἐνῆσαν δὲ καὶ

21 *τε* om. 𝔅Pz, Holder 22 *πάντες* 𝔅 || *οἱ* om. R : *οἱ Φωκέες* om. SV 23 *αὐτέων* z || *παρνησὸν* Marc. z || *κατειλημένοι* CP : *κατειλημμένοι* 24 *ὁρμεόμενοι* P, Stein[1], van H. : *ὁρμεώμενοι* Cz 26 *λακεδαίμονας* CMarc. || *θεσσαλίην . . ἐθνέων* om. R || *οἰκεομένους* z **32.** 2 *ὀνόμασται* z 3 *τε* om. CS || *ἦσαν* RSV corr. : *ἤνεσαν* Vpr.

Boiotian cavalry to be reckoned with, on which see c. 32 *ad f. infra*; as well as the Makedonians, just below.

21. **Φωκέων τοὺς χιλίους**: the article is important; this is that Chiliad which had shortly before arrived in camp, c. 17 *supra*, and had covered itself with dishonour at Thermopylai, 7. 217. It may fairly be concluded that this regiment had 'medized' there and then. Not so all the nation: a remnant, remaining in the land, gained credit for more patriotism.

23. **τὰ Ἑλλήνων ηὖξον**, sc. *πρήγματα*, favoured the Greek side, were for its growing. Cp. 3. 39 *τοῦ Πολυκράτεος τὰ πρήγματα αὔξετο*, 6. 132 *τότε μᾶλλον αὔξετο* (sc. *ὁ Μιλτιάδης*). Cp. also 8. 30 *supra*.

περὶ τὸν Παρνησσὸν κατειλημένοι: cp. 8. 27 *κατειλήθησαν ἐς τὸν Παρνησὸν* (*sic*) *οἱ Φωκέες* (on another and previous occasion). Parnassos was naturally the refuge of the Phokians, whether from Thessalians, Persians, or others; cp. 8. 32. Hdt. may have varied in spelling; cp. the singular 'Plataia' in 8. 50 *supra*.

24. **ἐνθεῦτεν ὁρμώμενοι**: cp. 8. 133, 'from that, as their headquarters.'

ἔφερόν τε καὶ ἦγον, 'kept on looting.' *φέρειν* would primarily suggest portable commodities, *ἄγειν* living beasts, etc. The assistance rendered by the 'loyal' Phokians does not appear to have amounted to very much. A really large force of confederate Greeks on Parnassos, in the rear of the Persian position in Boiotia, might have been of considerable strategic importance: but perhaps less than justice is done to the services of the Phokians.

26. **Μακεδόνας**: the Makedonian contingent was probably in the main cavalry, which was the chief strength of Makedonian armies, from the one Alexander to the other; though the great development in this respect is put down by Thucydides (2. 100. 2) to Archelaos (413 B.C.), it is doubtful whether any 'hoplite' organization existed in the Makedonian army before Philip II.; cp. Kaerst *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa, ii. 447. There may also have been some Makedonian *ψιλοί*. On the previous service of the Makedonians cp. 8. 34, 140, c. 1 *supra*.

τοὺς περὶ Θεσσαλίην οἰκημένους. As *Θεσσαλοί* have already been specified, this phrase is to be understood of 'dwellers in the parts about Thessaly,' other than Thessalians proper, e.g. 'Achaians.' Cp. the list of medizing Greeks in 7. 132, and more especially the list of contingents 7. 185 (including Perrhaiboi, Enienes, Dolopes, Magnetes, Achaians).

32. 1. **τὰ μέγιστα ὠνόμασται**, that is, the five divisions named above, Persians, Medes, Baktrians, Indians, Sakans, were not exclusively composed of men drawn respectively from the nations named, but each division, while containing men of various nations, has been named from the greatest and most conspicuous nationality comprised in it.

ἄλλων ἐθνέων ἄνδρες ἀναμεμιγμένοι, Φρυγῶν τε καὶ Μυσῶν καὶ Θρηίκων τε καὶ Παιόνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἐν δὲ καὶ Αἰθιόπων τε καὶ Αἰγυπτίων οἵ τε Ἑρμοτύβιες καὶ οἱ Καλασίριες καλεόμενοι μαχαιροφόροι, οἵ περ εἰσὶ Αἰγυπτίων μοῦνοι μάχιμοι. τούτους δὲ ἔτι ἐν Φαλήρῳ ἐὼν ἀπὸ τῶν

---

4 τε om. van H. || Μυσῶν hic pos. **B**, Holder, van H.: ap. cet. cum Θρηίκων locum mutaverat: id conservat Stein 5 θρηικῶν ACP: θριηικῶν B: θρηκῶν **B** 8 ἐὼν ἐν Φαλήρῳ z

---

4. **Φρυγῶν τε καὶ Μυσῶν**: Phrygians and Mysians may be taken to represent the Asianic levies. On the Phrygians cp. 7. 73; on the Mysians cp. 7. 74. Stein[5] recognizes that the order of the text in R (**B**) is *sachrichtig*; cp. App. Crit.

5. **Θρηίκων τε καὶ Παιόνων.** Thracians and Paionians may be taken to represent European levies drawn from the countries east of the Axios. On the Thracians cp. 7. 110; Paionians, 7. 113, 124; and on both 7. 185. (Were these mainly in the division of Artabazos?)

6. **Αἰθιόπων τε καὶ Αἰγυπτίων**: the Ethiopians and Egyptians represent the Libyan levies as a whole. Ethiopians have been described in the army-list of Xerxes 7. 69. Egyptians are, however, a new feature in the land-forces; their levy and armature have been described, 7. 89, in the navy-list. Their presence at Plataia calls for explanation, which Hdt. proceeds to offer, not without involving himself in some remarkable discrepancies.

οἵ τε . . μάχιμοι. This note on the Ἑρμοτύβιες and the Καλασίριες is a gloss, or a later insertion by the author's hand, for (i.) it can only refer to the Egyptians, yet here it must also be referred to the Ethiopians! (ii.) The grammar of the whole passage is faultless without it, the genitives *Αἰθ. τε καὶ Αἰγ.* being strictly co-ordinate with *τῶν ἄλλων* etc. and following *ἄνδρες*. (iii.) As a note on *Αἰγυπτίων* the sentence would have come in much better in 7. 89. (iv.) The absence of a reference to 2. 164 ff. is remarkable. This note appears to be a reminiscence of that disquisition on the Egyptian castes (*γένεα*) in general, and the warrior caste, or castes, in particular. Whether gloss, or addition by the author's hand, this observation points to the later composition of the Egyptian *Logoi*, and the prior composition of the story of the Persian war, by our author; but the four reasons above given marks the sentence rather as a gloss than as an author's addition. Cp. Introduction, §§ 7-9.

7. **μαχαιροφόροι**: cp. 7. 89, where their arms are much more fully described, the description ending *μαχαίρας δὲ μεγάλας εἶχον*.

8. **τούτους δὲ ἔτι ἐν Φαλήρῳ ἐὼν κτλ.** The Egyptian fleet of 200 ships might have mustered 6000 Epibatai (cp. 7. 184) while intact; but then, were they 'Egyptians'? Cp. 7. 96. The statement that Mardonios, while still in Phaleron, debarked these Epibatai for his own purpose deserves attention. What becomes of the hasty flight of the fleet from Salamis (8. 107)? What becomes of the *διάκρισις* of the forces in Thessaly (8. 113)? It might be argued from the presence of Egyptians in the forces of Mardonios that the fleet, or some portion of it, the Egyptian squadron at least, accompanied the king on his retirement. The assertion that Mardonios selected the Egyptian Epibatai at Phaleron is obviously the translation into narrative of the reason, which immediately follows (*οὐ γὰρ ἐτάχθησαν κτλ.*), in the light of the supposed departure of the fleet straight from Salamis, 8. 107. It is true that, according to *l.c.*, Xerxes before the departure of the fleet *καλέσας Μαρδόνιον ἐκέλευσέ μιν τῆς στρατιῆς διαλέγειν τοὺς βούλεται*, and to fulfil his engagement. But nothing is there said of taking any men from the fleet, and Mardonios himself, only a few hours before, has been inveighing against the cowardice of the Egyptians, etc. (8. 100), in a way hardly consistent with his including them in his select force!

The fair inference, however, is not that there were Egyptians all along in the land-forces, but that Hdt. in various contexts preserves various stories and

νεῶν ἀπεβιβάσατο ἐόντας ἐπιβάτας· οὐ γὰρ ἐτάχθησαν ἐς τὸν πεζὸν τὸν ἅμα Ξέρξῃ ἀπικόμενον ἐς Ἀθήνας Αἰγύπτιοι. τῶν μὲν δὴ βαρβάρων ἦσαν τριήκοντα μυριάδες, ὡς καὶ πρότερον δεδήλωται· τῶν δὲ Ἑλλήνων τῶν Μαρδονίου συμμάχων οἶδε μὲν οὐδεὶς ἀριθμόν· οὐ γὰρ ὦν ἠριθμήθησαν·

---

9 νηῶν **B**z 10 ἐς τὰς Marc. z 11 ἔσαν z 12 πρότερόν μοι z 13 ἠρίθμησαν **B**

---

statements from various sources, often contradictory or more or less contrary to each other, without staying to criticize, to harmonize, to reduce all to self-consistency.

11. **τριήκοντα μυριάδες**: 300,000 is the figure which Hdt. consistently maintains for the fighting men of Mardonios. This figure, however, in 8. 113 appears to include the *ἱππεῖς*. Here the *ἱππεῖς* appear not to be included. It also includes the 60,000 (infantry and cavalry) of the division of Artabazos, 8. 126. This division is given as only 40,000 below (c. 66), and though the difference may be accounted for by the supposed loss of 20,000 before Poteidaia, and in Thrace (cp. 8. 126–129), yet Hdt. fails to subtract these two myriads from the estimate of Mardonios' forces in this place.

The army of Mardonios consists of five divisions, above described, together with a sixth of 'Greek allies,' which Hdt. computes at 50,000 men (making 350,000 in all). Probably the division of Artabazos may be considered here to be absent, and the five divisions of barbarians may be taken as each consisting *ex hypothesi* of 50,000, or 250,000 in all; that is, each division consists of five myriads (nominal), each under a myriarch (and each myriad again is subdivided into 10 chiliads, nominal, each led by a chiliarch). The division perhaps consists of 4 myriads of foot, and 1 myriad of cavalry. If Artabazos had really 60,000 men in his division, he may have had an extra myriad, perhaps cavalry, for the king's escort; or the figure may have been reached by reckoning his division as 50,000 *πεζοί*, and adding a myriad *ἱππεῖς*—in fact, counting the myriad of cavalry twice over; the 40,000 men in c. 66 *infra* represents his normal number of *πεζοί*.

But this army of Mardonios, in six divisions of 50,000 each, viz. 40,000 *πεζοί* +10,000 *ἱππεῖς*, is none other than the original army of Xerxes, the organization of which has been quite clearly, not quite consciously, indicated in Bk. 7, where the numbers have been vastly exaggerated.

Either, then, Mardonios retained the whole army *τὸν ἅμα Ξέρξῃ ἀπικόμενον*, and was in command of a (nominal) 300,000, a very improbable alternative; or he did indeed only command a selection, or a section, of the grand army, perhaps the very division, 50,000 strong, of which he had been all along in command, while Artabazos commanded a second division of equal strength, the army of 479 B.C. numbering in all 100,000—exclusive of the European allies; or possibly Mardonios commanded two divisions, which with the division under Artabazos might raise the total Asiatic forces in Europe to 150,000, or thereabouts. See further, Appendices II. § 5, and VIII. § 2.

ὡς καὶ πρότερον δεδήλωται: the reference is clearly to Bk. 8, cc. 100, 113, but the verb is much too strong; *εἴρηται* (as elsewhere) would meet the case: a *δήλωσις* should have included the items! The words may be a gloss, especially without *μοι*. Cp. App. Crit.

12. **τῶν Μαρδονίου συμμάχων**: among the 'allies' of Mardonios must be included the Makedonians, whom Hdt. perhaps would not deny as 'Hellenes,' as well as the Boiotians, Lokrians, Malians, Phokians, Thessalians, and dwellers in the parts about Thessaly; cp. c. 31 *supra*. If these peoples were allies of 'Mardonios' especially, that would be a source of strength to him against Artabazos. But the phrase, perhaps, merely substitutes Mardonios, as commander-in-chief, for the king; or the king's subjects might be 'allies' of Mardonios; cp. 8. 24.

13. **οἶδε μὲν οὐδεὶς ἀριθμόν**: this would indeed be a rash statement unless Hdt. had literary and documentary evidence to go on. He evidently believes himself to be in control of relatively com-

ὡς δὲ ἐπεικάσαι, ἐς πέντε μυριάδας συλλεγῆναι εἰκάζω. οὗτοι οἱ παραταχθέντες πεζοὶ ἦσαν, ἡ δὲ ἵππος χωρὶς ἐτέτακτο.

33 Ὡς δὲ ἄρα πάντες οἱ ἐτετάχατο κατὰ ἔθνεα καὶ κατὰ τέλεα, ἐνθαῦτα τῇ δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ ἐθύοντο καὶ ἀμφότεροι.

---

14 ἐπεικάσαι ἐστὶ **a**C : ἀπεικάσαι ἐστὶ Pz : ἀπεικάσαι **B**, Holder 15 ἔσαν z 33. 1 πάντες om. **B**, Holder || ἐτέτακτο (πάντες omisso) Gomperz || κατά τε ἔθνεα **B**, Holder, van H. : καὶ τὰ ἔθνεα B

---

plete sources on the war; none of his authorities supplied an exact figure for the number of the Greek allies of Mardonios, and he is therefore left to conjecture on his own account. Some of his authorities may also have indulged expressly in conjectures, but he prefers his own.

οὐ γὰρ ὦν ἠριθμήθησαν: this statement, given as the reason, is probably itself an inference from the fact, that there was no positive tradition on the subject. **οὐ γὰρ ὦν** cp. c. 31 *supra*. Hdt.'s own conjecture of 50,000 is perhaps relative to the figure already given, at least implicitly, for each of the other five divisions of the army of Mardonios. Hdt. makes no attempt to distribute the total among the items. The chiliad of Phokians is the only detailed figure given. It is not likely that the Boiotians, Lokrians, Malians, Thessalians, and dwellers in the parts about Thessaly, with the Makedonians, put 49,000 men into the field of Plataia. Hdt. is speaking of fighting men. He only allows at most 11,600 Hoplites in the Greek left wing, opposed to this the sixth corps in the Persian line; cp. 31 *supra*. A 'myriad' for the Greek allies of Mardonios would be a fair estimate.

15. **ἡ δὲ ἵππος χωρὶς ἐτέτακτο**: the pluperfect can hardly be pressed into meaning that the cavalry had previously been drawn up and assigned a different position; it is only = ἦσαν χωρὶς τεταγμένοι (οἱ ἱππεῖς). Cavalry certainly formed part of the battle-array. The words may, however, fairly be taken to mean that the cavalry had a distinct position, the infantry being in continuous formation. But all the cavalry was not in one place. Most probably the Greek cavalry was on the extreme right, and the Persian cavalry on the extreme left of the position. This conjecture is borne out by the subsequent narrative, notably the exploit of the Persian cavalry in c. 39, and that of the Hellenic c. 69 *infra*. ἡ δὲ ἵππος χωρὶς curiously anticipates a phrase which became current in connexion with the legend of Marathon (cp. Hdt. IV.–VI. ii. 231).

It is not quite clear in this passage whether Hdt. means to exclude the cavalry from the numerical computations just given. *Prima facie* he excludes it only from the παράταξις. Moreover, cavalry must surely be included in his computation of the 50,000 allies. Again, in 8. 113 the Persian cavalry appears to be expressly included in the 300,000. All which considered, it may be concluded that the cavalry is not here to be reckoned separately, difficult as it remains on that plan to account for the figures 60,000 assigned to the *corps d'armée* under Artabazos 8. 126 (and to Tigranes c. 69 *infra*, or rather Masistes, *vide* notes *in l.*).

33. 1. **ἐτετάχατο**: their formation in battle-array had been accomplished—a fresh development, or stage (**ἄρα**); the pluperfect is temporal.

κατὰ ἔθνεα καὶ κατὰ τέλεα: both terms refer alike to the infantry and to the cavalry; cp. 7. 81.

2. **τῇ δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ**, i.e. the day after the one on which the Greeks had advanced and taken up the position near the Androkrateion and Gargaphia, and on which Mardonios had moved out, and somewhat westwards, to face them. With these words the Journal, or Diary, of Plataia may be said to begin, but unfortunately implicit reliance cannot be placed on the data (cp. Appendix VIII. § 2). Both sides (**καὶ ἀμφότεροι**, you might not have expected it of the barbarians) had sacrifices offered, with a view to ascertaining whether they should deliver the attack; on each side the signs were unfavourable to the offensive; cp. c. 36 *infra*. Ancient armies approached each other very nearly before a shot could be loosed, or a blow dealt. It must often have been necessary to devise some plan for restraining the impatience of the men in such close proximity to the foe from breaking line

Ἕλλησι μὲν Τεισαμενὸς Ἀντιόχου ἦν ὁ θυόμενος· οὗτος γὰρ δὴ εἵπετο τῷ στρατεύματι τούτῳ μάντις· τὸν ἐόντα Ἠλεῖον καὶ γένεος τοῦ Ἰαμιδέων [Κλυτιάδην] Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐποιήσαντο λεωσφέτερον. Τεισαμενῷ γὰρ μαντευομένῳ ἐν

---

3 Τεισαμενὸς van H., Stein[3] : *τισαμενὸς* (et sic passim) 5 Κλυτιάδου S : Κλυτιάδην del. Valckenaer 6 λεὼ σφέτερον **a** : *νεωστὶ σφέτερον* Naber : *πολιήτην σφέτερον* Cobet, van H.

---

and charging forward. The necessity for a 'sign' could obviously be utilized. In the present case, with the deep Asopos bed, not dry either, between them, a great advantage lay with the side which could induce the other to cross the stream.

3. **Τεισαμενὸς Ἀντιόχου.** The proper name Antiochos was both heroic and of common occurrence. One of the Attic tribes (*φυλαί*) was named the Antiochis, from an enchorial hero or *ἀρχηγέτης*: that Antiochos was a 'Herakleid' (ps.-Demosth. *Epitaph.* 31), and the name recurs at Athens in the fifth century (e.g. Xenoph. *Hell.* 1. 5. 11). It is found also in Makedonia, Thuc. 2. 80. 6 (a source from which it was destined to spread far and wide), and occurs throughout Hellas (Messenia, Pausan. 4. 4. 4 ; Arkadia, Xenoph. *Hell.* 7. 1. 33, etc. etc.). This Eleian (of whom nothing more is known) is not included in the list of twenty Antiochi, antecedent to Antiochos Soter, in Pauly-Wissowa, i. 2449 f. The name Teisamenos is first found applied to the son of Orestes, son of Agamemnon, who succeeded his father as king of Lakedaimon, and was driven out by the Herakleids on their 'restoration,' Pausan. 2. 18. 6 ; cp. c. 26 *supra*. A second Teisamenos, son of Thersandros, son of Polyneikes, appears among the heroic kings of Thebes ; cp. 4. 147, 6. 52 *supra*. A Trachinian of the name appears in Thucydides 3. 92. 2 as an envoy to Sparta in the year 427–426 B.C., and the name was in use at Athens (cp. *C.I.A.* vol. i. pp. 52, 72, No. 133, 414–3 B.C.). Of the one here in question little is known except what Hdt. records—for Plutarch, *Arist.* 11, adds nothing, and Pausanias, 3. 11. 5–8, 6. 14. 13, only some details not affecting the story of Plataia ; e.g. his son's and grandson's names, Agelochos and Agias. This Agias was diviner to Lysandros at Aigospotami (405 B.C.), and the diviner Teisamenos, who was implicated in the conspiracy of Kinadon (397 B.C., Xenoph. *Hell.* 3. 3. 11), was presumably his son, or brother.

5. **Ἰαμιδέων** : cp. Pausan. 6. 2. 5 *οἱ δ' Ἰαμίδαι καλούμενοι μάντεις γεγόνασιν ἀπὸ Ἰάμου· τὸν δὲ εἶναι παῖδα Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ λαβεῖν μαντικήν φησιν ἐν ᾄσματι Πίνδαρος.* The reference is to *Ol.* 6. 43–51. (Perhaps the clan were 'medicine-men,' cp. *ἰάομαι*, followers of Apollo *ἰατρός*, or *παιήων*, before they were 'soothsayers.') The Iamids, though at home perhaps in Elis, were to be found far and wide throughout Hellas ; the Pindaric Ode cited was composed in honour of Agesias, an Iamid of Syracuse (diviner to Hieron), whose branch of the family was rooted in Arkadia (Stymphalos). There were two other mantic families or clans in Elis, the Telliadai, cp. c. 37 *infra*, and the *Κλυτιάδαι* ; cp. Cicero, *de Div.* 1. 41. *Κλυτιάδην* here must be a gloss, and an error. Blakesley's note is ingenious. "*Κλυτιάδην* was originally an alternative, both families claiming Tisamenos : *Κλυτιάδου* was an harmonistic improvement in S. or the archetype of S." ; cp. App. Crit.

6. **λεωσφέτερον** : an *hapaxlegomenon* absolutely. Two etymologies have been proposed : (1) *λέως*, *λείως*, Ion. adv. = *τελέως*, 'completely their own' ; cp. L. & S. (2) *λεώς* (Attic) = *λαός* *populus, popularis.* The Ionic form points to (1), though *λεώς* is found in Hdt. (e.g. 8. 136). In neither case is the word in form a laconism. On *λείως* cp. Weir Smyth, *Ionic*, § 716, p. 614.

γάρ : digressive. Hdt. here inserts a pure digression on the biography of Teisamenos, which, though interrupting the story of Plataia, contains very important matters bearing upon Laconian law, the history of the *Pentekontaëteris*, the date of the composition of his own work, and other matters.

μαντεύεσθαι is used by Hdt. indifferently (*a*) of the consultant as here, cp. 8. 36, etc. ; (*b*) of the diviner, c. 35

Δελφοῖσι περὶ γόνου ἀνεῖλε ἡ Πυθίη ἀγῶνας τοὺς μεγίστους ἀναιρήσεσθαι πέντε. ὁ μὲν δὴ ἁμαρτὼν τοῦ χρηστηρίου προσεῖχε γυμνασίοισι ὡς ἀναιρησόμενος γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας, ἀσκέων δὲ πεντάεθλον παρὰ ἓν πάλαισμα ἔδραμε νικᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδα, Ἱερωνύμῳ τῷ Ἀνδρίῳ ἐλθὼν ἐς ἔριν. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ μαθόντες οὐκ ἐς γυμνικοὺς ἀλλ' ἐς ἀρηίους ἀγῶνας

7 *γόνου*: *ἀγῶνος* sive *ἀγώνων* ? Krueger 9 *τοῖσι γυμνασίοισι* z 10 *πένταθλον* **B** 11 *ἀνδρείωι* C || *μαθόντες δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι* z 12 *ἀρκίους* Marc. z

infra, etc.; and even (*c*) of the god, as in 1. 65.

ἐν Δελφοῖσι: the notice suggests a possible source, and, if the story was picked up by Hdt. in Delphi, the digression might well belong to the second draft of the work, and be an insertion after his visit to Greece. The last date involved in the story is the year of the battle of Tanagra, 457 B.C. See below.

7. **περὶ γόνου**: cp. 5. 92 *ἐστάλη ὦν ἐς Δελφοὺς περὶ γόνου*. Schweighaeuser doubted the reading here. The answer looks like a bad pun (*γόνον, ἀγῶνα*). Teisamenos had a son Agelochos, Pausan. 3. 11. 5.

ἀνεῖλε: *ἀναιρέειν edere* (*responsum*), cp. 1. 13 *τὸ χρηστήριον* (subj.), 2. 52 *τὸ μαντήιον*, 6. 69 *οἱ μάντιες*.

8. **ἀναιρήσεσθαι**: cp. c. 64 *infra νίκην ἀναιρέεται καλλίστην*, and with *ἀγῶνα per metonymiam*, 6. 70, 103, cp. 5. 102 (active).

10. **ἀσκέων δὲ πεντάεθλον**: cp. 6. 92 *ἀνὴρ πεντάεθλον ἐπασκήσας*. The five-fold contest consisted of 'Jump, Race, Quoit, Javelin, Wrestling' according to the epigram ascribed to Simonides, 153 (Bergk iii.[4] 500):

Ἴσθμια καὶ Πυθοῖ Διοφῶν ὁ Φίλωνος ἐνίκα,
ἅλμα ποδωκείην δίσκον ἄκοντα πάλην,

perhaps in the order of the said pentameter. Pausan. 5. 8. 3 dates its introduction at Olympia to Ol. 18.

παρὰ ἓν πάλαισμα ἔδραμε: an odd combination, 'he only missed running an Olympic victory in the Pentathlon by one bout, or fall, in the wrestling.' One may take *ἔδραμε* as mere metaphor ('scoring,' cp. 7. 57). *παρά*, 'exclusive'; cp. Thuc. 7. 2. 4 *παρὰ τοσοῦτον* ('by so little') *μὲν αἱ Συράκουσαι ἦλθον κινδύνου* (of being surrounded and taken). Teisamenos had presumably scored victories in two out of the five events, but was thrown twice in the final event by one of the other competitors. It surely was never necessary for victory in the Pentathlon to win all five events: three out of the five must have scored a win. Thus it would not always be necessary to hold all five, cp. Plutarch, *Symp.* 9. 2. 2 *ταῖς τρισίν, ὥσπερ οἱ πένταθλοι, περίεστι καὶ νικᾷ*. Cp. also Aischyl. *Agam.* 181 *τριακτῆρος οἴχεται τυχών* and note *ad l. ap.* Wecklein, *Orestie* (1888); esp. Pollux, 3. 30 *ἐπὶ πεντάθλου τὸ νικῆσαι ἀποτριάξαι λέγουσι*. Cp. further the next note.

11. **Ἱερωνύμῳ τῷ Ἀνδρίῳ**: the name Hieronymos was in use at Athens (cp. Aristoph. *Ach.* 386, *Eccl.* 201), Elis (Xenoph. *Anab.* 3. 1. 34), Syracuse (Diod. 26. 15. 1–2), and elsewhere. The Andrian too had perhaps claims to a sacral character. Pausanias (6. 14. 13) saw a statue of him at Olympia, where his victory over Teisamenos was memorable; and also (3. 11. 6) mentions that he was defeated by the Eleian in running and leaping, though successful in the wrestling; he omits the disk and the javelin, in which also he must have been victorious; cp. the previous note.

The Pentathlon must have been conducted in 'heats,' and the heats in wrestling, from the nature of the case, *κατὰ λόγον μουνομαχίης*, but we need not conclude that Hieronymos was the only other competitor on this occasion.

The Olympiad of Teisamenos and Hieronymos is not specified; it can hardly have been so recent as the 75th (=480 B.C.), but as Plataia is the first of the *μέγιστοι ἀγῶνες* it may have been the 74th = 484 B.C.

Λακεδαιμόνιοι δέ: the overtures apparently come from the Spartan side, inspired perhaps by Delphi, or by friends of the Eleian himself.

φέρον τὸ Τεισαμενοῦ μαντήιον, μισθῷ ἐπειρῶντο πείσαντες Τεισαμενὸν ποιέεσθαι ἅμα Ἡρακλειδέων τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι ἡγεμόνα τῶν πολέμων. ὃ δὲ ὁρέων περὶ πολλοῦ ποιευμένους Σπαρτιήτας φίλον αὐτὸν προσθέσθαι, μαθὼν τοῦτο ἀνετίμα, σημαίνων σφι ὡς, ἤν μιν πολιήτην σφέτερον ποιήσωνται τῶν πάντων μεταδιδόντες, ποιήσει ταῦτα, ἐπ' ἄλλῳ μισθῷ δ' οὔ. Σπαρτιῆται δὲ πρῶτα μὲν ἀκούσαντες δεινὰ ἐποιεῦντο καὶ μετίεσαν τῆς χρησμοσύνης τὸ παράπαν, τέλος δὲ δείματος μεγάλου ἐπικρεμαμένου τοῦ Περσικοῦ τούτου στρατεύματος καταίνεον μετιόντες. ὃ δὲ γνοὺς τετραμμένους σφέας οὐδ'

13 Τεισαμενοῦ abesse malit van H. || σπείσαντες C 15 πολεμίων Marc. z || ὁρῶν **a**, Holder 16 προθέσθαι R 17 ποιήσονται R 18 ποιήσειν S, Schaefer 19 δεινά τε? Stein[2] || ἐποιεῦντο **B**, Stein[2], Holder: ἐποίευν τε (δεινά τε ἐποίευν van H.) 20 μετήεσαν Marc. 22 μετιόντες **B**, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: μετιέντες || οὐδὲ οὕτως **a**: οὐδὲ ὧς malit van H.

13. **φέρον ἐς,** 'bearing on,' as we say; cp. 6. 19 *τὸ χρηστήριον ἐς τοὺς Ἀργείους φέρον.*

ἐπειρῶντο πείσαντες: i.e. *μισθῷ πείσαντες ἐπειρῶντο ποιέεσθαι . . ἡγεμόνα τῶν πολέμων.* These words need not be taken to imply a limitation of the royal prerogative, least of all in the actual conduct of war operations. The phrase comes not from an official Spartan source, and Xenophon (*Lac. Rep.* 13) takes no account of any infringement of the king's functions in war as *ἱερεὺς μὲν τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς . . στρατηγὸς δὲ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.* But the king was not a *μάντις*, and this position in the royal suite was no doubt offered to the Eleian.

14. **Ἡρακλειδέων**: there were of course many Herakleids in Sparta beside the two kings (which accounts for the genitive), but the introduction of the word here is curious: it can hardly be a limitation, an emphatically partitive genitive, but must rather have been meant to suggest that the Iamidai and the Herakleidai were, so to speak, in one class; or the Iamids even a step higher, as co-ordinate with those of the Herakleids who were actually in the royal office.

15. **ὁρέων**: not so much a case of literal vision, *ὄψις*, as of perception by various channels, cp. *μαθὼν* just below. Hdt. does not always employ the terminology of sense perceptions with prosaic literalness or scientific accuracy; cp. 8. 12. 6, 88. 9, etc.

περὶ πολλοῦ ποιευμένους: cp. 7. 181, 8. 40; also *δεινὰ ἐποιεῦντο* just below.

16. **Σπαρτιήτας**: i.e. citizens of Sparta.

φίλον προσθέσθαι: cp. 3. 74.

ἀνετίμα, 'kept putting the price up,' a good imperfect; the word is rare in literature (as the language of the market!), but cp. Pollux 3. 125 *ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πολλοῦ πιπρασκόντων εἴποις ἂν ἐπιτιμῶσιν, ἀνατιμῶνται, ἐπιτείνουσι τὰς τιμάς, ὡς τὸ ἐναντίον ἐπευωνίζουσιν, ἄξια πιπράσκουσιν.*

19. **δεινὰ ἐποιεῦντο καὶ μετίεσαν τῆς χρησμοσύνης**: the text is in some doubt; *καὶ μετίεσαν* appears to me *de trop*, without it *τῆς χρ.* were plainly 'his demand.' *χρησμοσύνη* is a curious word. Schweighaeuser misunderstood it as = *μαντοσύνη*. It has nothing to do with *χρησμός*, but was used by Herakleitos (Bywater, No. xxiv. p. 11) as opposed to *κόρος*. Cp. *χρηίζειν*. The form *χρημοσύνη* is found in Tyrtaios and Theognis; cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

μετίεσαν τῆς χρησμοσύνης must mean 'abandoned their desire, or request'—relaxed (of) their need—the usual construction being with the accus. *rei*, but the gen. being also found; e.g. *Il.* 6. 330 *ὃν τινά που μεθιέντα ἴδοις στυγεροῦ πολέμοιο.* The occurrence of *μετιόντες* just below makes an inelegancy by 'unconscious iteration': **καταίνεον μετιόντες,** 'they went after him and agreed,' consented (imperf.): though *μετιέντες* would be worse.

22. **γνούς**: cp. *μαθών, ὁρέων* above.

οὕτω ἔτι ἔφη ἀρκέεσθαι τούτοισι μούνοισι, ἀλλὰ δεῖν ἔτι τὸν ἀδελφεὸν ἑωυτοῦ Ἡγίην γίνεσθαι Σπαρτιήτην ἐπὶ τοῖσι
34 αὐτοῖσι λόγοισι τοῖσι καὶ αὐτός [γίνεται]. ταῦτα δὲ λέγων οὗτος ἐμιμέετο Μελάμποδα, ὡς εἰκάσαι βασιληίην τε καὶ

---

23 ἔφη ἔτι z || ἔτι καὶ z 24 αὐτοῦ P: aut τὸν aut ἑωυτοῦ delend. cens. Krueger, van H. || γενέσθαι z 25 γίνεται del. van H., Stein[3]

τετραμμένους σφέας, 'their change of mind'; repeated c. 34 *infra*, cp. 7. 15 *τετραμμένῳ γὰρ δὴ καὶ μετεγνωκότι κτλ.*

23. **οὕτω . . τούτοισι μούνοισι** looks pleonastic; cp. *ταῦτα οὕτω* 8. 119.

ἀρκέεσθαι, pass. 'to be satisfied with' is observable; cp. Aristot. *Eth. N.* 2. 7. 5=1107 B *ἀρκούμενοι αὐτῷ τούτῳ.*

τὸν ἀδελφεὸν ἑωυτοῦ Ἡγίην. Stein seems to think that the man's childlessness led him to secure for his brother (and family) a position in Sparta. But the Delphian response *περὶ γόνου* may have been as favourable in his case as in that of Eëtion, 5. 92. Pausanias reports descendants of his in Sparta (*l.c. supra*); they may, of course, have been his brother's (or his own by adoption). The form Hegias is Ionic (and Attic) for Ἁγίας or Ἀγίας, a name perhaps identical with Ἆγις. (It cannot even in this family be connected with ἅγιος, Ἁγίων, the α in which is short.) The name recurs in the pedigree, Teisamenos, Agelochos, Agias, Pausan. 3. 11. 5.

24. **Σπαρτιήτην**, 'a full citizen'; cp. *πολιήτην σφέτερον* and *λεωσφέτερον* above.

34. 2. **οὗτος ἐμιμέετο Μελάμποδα**, 'Teisamenos was copying Melampûs.' The story of Melampûs here is a digression within a digression, but may be of the same date in the composition of Hdt.'s work as the story of Teisamenos; see, however, below, and Introduction, § 9. 'Teisamenos did but follow the example of Melampûs' (Hdt. is great on plagiarists; so Kleisthenes of Athens copied his grandfather of Sikyon, 5. 67) 'with a difference.' **ὡς εἰκάσαι βασιληίην τε καὶ πολιητίην αἰτεομένους** (cp. App. Crit.), 'if we may compare men together who were demanding respectively kingship and citizenship.' Melampûs was even more exigeant than Teisamenos. Melampûs had still reputed descendants in Greece; a descendant of his was with Leonidas at Thermopylai, cp. 7. 221. His death perhaps created the vacancy filled by the Eleian. Hdt. gives the name of the father of Melampûs as Amytheon, 2. 49 (i.e. Ἀμυθάων), and if the patronymic always proved the earliest notice, that passage would be of earlier composition than this, and this digression on Melampûs (probably) of later composition (third hand) than the digression on Teisamenos (second hand) in which it is embedded. Amythaon apparently belongs (in Homer) to the south Thessalian cycle; his mother is Tyro, his father Kretheus, his brothers are Aison and Pheres, the Poseidonian Pelias and Neleus are his uterine brethren; *Od.* 11. 253 ff. A part of Elis was named Ἀμυθαονία, Steph. B. *sub v.* ('perhaps the territory of Triphylian Pylos,' Hirschfeld *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa i. 2014). Amythaon himself has been traced to a chthonian source, as 'a personification of Hades' (cp. Wernicke, *ibid.*). Melampûs is the *μάντις ἀμύμων* who won the daughter of Neleus 'for his brother,' *Od.* 11. 291, a story more fully set forth *Od.* 15. 226 ff., where Pylos is given as his proper home, whence he passes to Argos, *ναιέμεναι πολλοῖσιν ἀνάσσοντ' Ἀργείοισιν*, without the process being further explained—which, however, hardly proves that 'Homer' did not 'know' the explanation.

Diodoros 4. 68 gives the story in rationalized form; Apollodoros 2. 2. 2 more clearly supplies the part played by the women, in the first instance the daughters of Proitos; Pausanias 2. 18. 4 adds the duration of the dynasties. Five kings succeeded Bias (in four generations) and six succeeded Melampûs (in six generations, down to Amphilochos; cp. 7. 91 *supra*), i.e. the dynasty of Melampûs outlasted that of Bias, while the native dynasty of the house of Anaxagoras, son of Argos, outlasted both the others, but was displaced by Orestes, son of Agamemnon.

The connexion with the Dionysiac orgies ascribed to Melampûs in 2. 49 does not at first sight square with the

πολιτηίην αἰτεομένους. καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ Μελάμπους τῶν ἐν Ἄργεϊ γυναικῶν μανεισέων, ὥς μιν οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἐμισθοῦντο ἐκ Πύλου παῦσαι τὰς σφετέρας γυναῖκας τῆς νούσου, μισθὸν προετείνατο τῆς βασιληίης τὸ ἥμισυ. οὐκ ἀνασχομένων δὲ τῶν Ἀργείων ἀλλ' ἀπιόντων, ὡς ἐμαίνοντο πλεῦνες τῶν γυναικῶν, οὕτω δὴ ὑποστάντες τὰ ὁ Μελάμπους προετείνατο ἤισαν δώσοντές οἱ ταῦτα. ὃ δὲ ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ἐπορέγεται ὁρέων αὐτοὺς τετραμμένους, φάς, ἢν μὴ καὶ τῷ ἀδελφεῷ Βίαντι μεταδῶσι τὸ τριτημόριον τῆς βασιληίης, οὐ ποιήσειν τὰ βούλονται. οἱ δὲ Ἀργεῖοι ἀπειληθέντες ἐς στεινὸν καταινέουσι καὶ ταῦτα. ὧς δὲ καὶ Σπαρτιῆται, ἐδέοντο γὰρ δεινῶς τοῦ **35**

---

34. 3 *αἰτεομένους* Stein : *αἰτεόμενον* Reiske, Holder, van H. : *αἰτεόμενος* 4 *ἄργειν* R ‖ *μανασέων* z 5 *νόσου* **B**C Marc., Stein³ 6 *προετείνετο* z 7 *ἀλλὰ* **a** ‖ *πολλῷ πλεῦνες* **B**z, Holder, van H. 8 *προετείνετο* C 9 *ἤεισαν* Marc. ‖ *ἐπορέγετο* z ‖ *ὁρῶν* **a**, Holder 10 *ἢν καὶ μὴ* **B** 11 *μεταδώσει* RV : *μεταδώσειν* S **35.** 1 *ὡς* ABRz : *ὧς* van H. ‖ *καὶ* om. **B**

---

therapeutic agency here ascribed to him; but the diviner may possibly have cast out Beelzebub by the aid of Beelzebub on homoeopathic principles.

8. **ὑποστάντες**, not understanding, but 'undergoing,' undertaking, agreeing to; cp. *δίκας ὑποστῆναι* c. 94 *infra*.

προτείνεσθαι (*bis*) may be used of a proposal from either side; cp. 7. 160.

9. **ἤισαν δώσοντες**, *daturi erant*, Stein (or rather *datum ibant*?). But here, in view of *ἀπιόντων* just before, *ἤισαν* is not to be taken as a mere auxiliary, but means 'they went,' to Pylos, a second time.

ὁρέων . . τετραμμένους = *γνοὺς τετραμμένους* c. 33 *supra*; otherwise it might have been taken in a more literal and physical sense.

10. **Βίαντι.** Bias is not actually named in Homer, and the winning of a bride for 'his brother' (*Od.* 15. 237) is all that is ascribed to Melampûs in this connexion. That Saga is told in Pausan. 4. 36. 3 and more fully by Apollodoros 1. 9. 12 (from which place it appears that the cunning of 'Blackfoot' was of more value than the strength of 'Bias').

11. **τὸ τριτημόριον τῆς βασιληίης.** He had demanded *τὸ ἥμισυ*, in the first instance, for himself; the other half—as 'goes without saying'—to be left to the native king (i.e. Anaxagoras). How much did he now demand for his brother? How much did he keep for himself? How much was he asking for in all? If he was to have one-half and his brother one-third, he was asking now for five-sixths, which is hardly credible, especially as his demand was granted. He may have been demanding still one-half for himself and one-third of the remaining half for his brother, i.e. one-sixth of the whole for his brother, their shares amounting together to two-thirds of the whole. Schweighaeuser takes it in this sense. The ancient authorities all take the division as into three equal thirds. (So Diodor., Pausan., Schol. to Pindar, *Nem.* 9. 30.) There is this much to be urged for the second alternative: (*a*) nothing is said by Hdt. of the withdrawal of the previous condition; (*b*) it corresponds more nearly with the relative duration of the two dynasties, in Pausanias six and four generations respectively; (*c*) the diviner would presumably keep the lion's share for himself. (The proportions would then have been Melampûs one-half, Anaxagoras one-third, Bias one-sixth.)

12. **ἀπειληθέντες ἐς στεινόν**: *στεινόν* must be properly an adjective; the substantive is *στεῖνος*: cp. c. 13 *supra*. For *ἀπειλ.* cp. 8. 109, and cp. *κατειλημένοι* c. 31 *supra*.

35. 1. **ὧς** = *οὕτως*, cp. 8. 126. 12 etc.

ἐδέοντο γὰρ δεινῶς τοῦ T., 'for they were terribly in want of Teisamenos.'

Τεισαμενοῦ, πάντως συνεχώρεόν οἱ. συγχωρησάντων δὲ καὶ ταῦτα τῶν Σπαρτιητέων, οὕτω δὴ πέντε σφι μαντευόμενος ἀγῶνας τοὺς μεγίστους Τεισαμενὸς ὁ Ἠλεῖος, γενόμενος Σπαρτιήτης, συγκαταιρέει. μοῦνοι δὲ δὴ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐγένοντο οὗτοι Σπαρτιήτῃσι πολιῆται. οἱ δὲ πέντε ἀγῶνες οἵδε ἐγένοντο, εἷς μὲν καὶ πρῶτος οὗτος ὁ ἐν Πλαταιῇσι, ἐπὶ δὲ ὁ ἐν Τεγέῃ πρὸς Τεγεήτας τε καὶ Ἀργείους γενόμενος, μετὰ δὲ ὁ ἐν Διπαιεῦσι πρὸς Ἀρκάδας πάντας πλὴν Μαντι-

---

2 *πάντα* Schaefer, van H.: *μάντιος*, coni. Stein² 3 *τῶν Σπαρτιητέων* del. van H. 7 *ἐπεὶ* C 8 *ἐν τῇ γέῃ* R || *τε* om. **B**Pz 9 *ὁ ἐν . . δὲ ὁ* om. C

---

2. **πάντως** has exercised the commentators; cp. App. Crit.

συνεχώρεον: cp. 7. 161.

3. **μαντευόμενος**, 'acting in the capacity of *μάντις*.' Cp. *βουλεύων*, *στρατηγῶν*, etc.

4. **ἀγῶνας τοὺς μεγίστους**, repeated from (the oracle in) c. 33 *supra*.

Τεισαμενὸς ὁ Ἠλεῖος γεν. Σπ. is stylistically observable; it marks the solemnity of the occasion with a quasi-heraldic flourish.

5. **συγκαταιρέει**: cf. *ἀναιρέειν* in fut. midd., *ibid.*

μοῦνοι δὲ δὴ . . πολιῆται. This remark destroys the sequence, and is probably a gloss. It would have come in better after *συνεχώρεόν οἱ* above. That it is inconsistent with the story of the Minyai 4. 145 would be no objection to it, for Hdt. might not have been acquainted with that story when he penned this remark, if authentic; besides, the Minyai were afterwards disfranchised; nor is Hdt. so careful to avoid inconsistencies. The statement, however, rules out the case of Tyrtaios (Plutarch, *Mor.* 230), the writer perhaps never having heard of him, or else considering him a Spartiate *von Haus aus*. The exclusiveness of the Spartan franchise was the ruin of the Spartan state; the Lakonic praetorians had as great an objection to *Uitlanders* as any people on record.

7. **ὁ ἐν Πλαταιῇσι**: that the battle 'in Plataia' (cp. cc. 16, 25 *supra*) is the first of the five *ἀγῶνες* seems to show that Teisamenos had not long been a citizen of Sparta in 479 B.C. Cp. c. 33 *supra*.

ἐπὶ δὲ ὁ ἐν Τεγέῃ: the adverbial use of *ἐπί* (local and temporal) is less common than that of *μετά* (temporal); *τούτῳ* may be understood. Cp. 7. 219, 8. 93, 113, etc.

No distinction is drawn in this place between the relative magnitude or importance of the five *ἀγῶνες*, they are all *μέγιστοι* perhaps simply as *ἀρήιοι* (cp. c. 33 *supra*), but also, perhaps, from any point of view, even without unduly depreciating the magnitude and importance of the first, which is here 'first' purely in time.

The battle of Tegea, against the Tegeatai and Argives, like the two which succeed it, was an episode in those *πόλεμοι οἰκεῖοι* which, according to Thuc. 1. 118. 2, preoccupied the Spartans, during the period of the growth of the power of Athens, but of which unfortunately very few details have been preserved for us. Cp. Strabo 377 *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν Ἀργεῖοι μετὰ Κλεωναίων καὶ Τεγεατῶν ἐπελθόντες ἄρδην τὰς Μυκήνας ἀνεῖλον καὶ τὴν χώραν διενείμαντο.* This passage exhibits the Tegeatai in alliance with Argos, and of course opposed to Sparta, at the time of the destruction of Mykenai; cp. c. 28 *supra*; but that was after the outbreak of the Helot war (Busolt, III. i. 121 n.). The battle of Tegea probably falls some years earlier, perhaps while the exiled Leotychidas was in residence there, 6. 72 *supra* (and Themistokles already in Argos?). It was evidently a victory, but not a decisive victory, for Sparta, as it was followed by a second great battle in Arkadia. Busolt (*l.c.*) refers the Epigram of Simonides (Bergk iii. 460, No. 102) to the Tegeatai who fell in this fight, and dates the event 473 B.C.

9. **ὁ ἐν Διπαιεῦσι**: Pausanias (who is the chief authority) makes Dipaia a

νέων, ἐπὶ δὲ ὁ Μεσσηνίων ὁ πρὸς Ἰσθμῷ· ὕστατος δὲ ὁ ἐν Ταναγρῃ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους τε καὶ Ἀργείους γενόμενος [οὗτος δὲ ὕστατος] κατεργάσθη τῶν πέντε ἀγώνων.

Οὗτος δὴ τότε τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ὁ Τεισαμενός, ἀγόντων τῶν **36**
Σπαρτιητέων, ἐμαντεύετο ἐν τῇ Πλαταιίδι. τοῖσι μέν νυν

---

10 ὁ ante Μεσσηνίων om. *z* || τῷ ἰσθμῷ **B***z*: Ἰθώμῃ Paulmier, Stein[1 2], Holder, van H. 11 οὗτος δὲ ὕστατος del. Stein[3]: οὗτος . . ἀγώνων secl. Krueger, van H. **36.** 1 δὲ S || ἀγὼν R(V) || τῶν om. S

---

town on the river Helisson (8. 31. 1) in the Arkadian district of Mainalia (3. 11. 7, cp. c. 11 l. 12 *supra*); it was one of the townships afterwards absorbed in Megalopolis (8. 27. 3). No details of the battle have been preserved, but it was a contest between the Spartans and all the Arkadians (less the Mantineians) and resulted in a victory for Sparta. The Argives are this time conspicuous by their absence; Busolt (III. i. 121 ff.) conjectures that they were engaged in the war with Tiryns, places the battle of Dipaia in 471 B.C., and ascribes the union of Arkadia to the intrigues of Themistokles.

Curtius, *Peloponnesos* i. 315, incidentally dates the battle 469 B.C., cp. *Gr. Ges.* ii.[6] (1888) 164, 829 (without precise date). The exact emplacement of Dipaia (Dipaieis) is disputed, notwithstanding the fact that the name survives in the district (village, *Dabia*).

(Polyainos 1. 41 = Xenoph. *Hell.* 7. 1. 28 ff., and has no bearing on this passage.)

10. **ὁ Μεσσηνίων ὁ πρὸς †Ἰσθμῷ.** Stein reverts to the reading of the codd. on the ground that Pausanias must have read Ἰσθμῷ here, as he attempts to harmonize this passage with Thuc. 1. 101–3. That is, supposing the text of Pausanias 3. 11. 8 to run: τέταρτον δὲ ἠγωνίσαντο πρὸς τοὺς ἐξ Ἰσθμοῦ ἐς Ἰθώμην ἀποστάντας τῶν Εἱλώτων. That is the vulgate, and is maintained by Hitzig-Bluemner as by Schubart, who says: *inepta haec verba* (ἐξ Ἰσθμοῦ) *reddidi Pausaniae e corrupto Herodoti libro* (9. 35) *ea transcribenti.* The ingenious emendation ἐκ τοῦ σεισμοῦ has been frequently advocated. Paumier (Palmerius) changed the Ἰσθμῷ here to Ἰθώμῃ. Those who adhere to the MS. reading are hard bestead to explain it. Stein[5] says there was an old Messenian king named Ἴσθμιος (Pausan. 4. 3. 10) and that there must have been a place in Messenia of the name Ἰσθμός. This is better than Rawlinson and Blakesley, who think that the Isthmos of Korinth is intended (which would certainly be τῷ Ἰσθμῷ): a battle between the Spartans and Messenians at 'the Isthmos' is hardly conceivable. The Helot war broke out in 464 B.C. and lasted ten years, Thuc. 1. 101–103, Busolt, III. i. 242. Busolt's idea that Μεσσηνίων here qualifies Ἰσθμῷ and distinguishes it thereby from the Korinthian Isthmos appears to be inadmissible. To give this sense the text should run: ἐπὶ δὲ ὁ πρὸς Ἰσθμῷ Μεσσηνίων. The text is in fact corrupt, ὁ Μεσσηνίων not being co-ordinate with the formula for the four other ἀγῶνες.

ὁ ἐν Ταναγρῃ: cp. Thuc. 1. 107. 3 ff. For the texts bearing on the battle cp. Hill, *Sources*, pp. 103 ff. The date of the battle is 457 B.C. (458–7); cp. Busolt, III. i. 311 ff. The regent Nikomedes was in command of the Lakedaimonians and allies; hence the presence of Teisamenos. The object of the expedition was the restoration of Theban power in Central Greece, as a makeweight against Athens, but the expedition was not an unqualified success from the Spartan point of view. This battle, as the last of the five ἀγῶνες, gives us an important term for the date of Hdt.'s own composition; cp. Introduction, § 9. Teisamenos was not present at the problematical battle of Oinoa! (cp. Hill, *op. c.* p. 298).

36. 1. ἀγόντων τῶν Σπαρτιητέων. The Spartans brought (led) him, not he them (notwithstanding their wish to make him their ἡγεμόνα τῶν πολέμων c. 33 *supra*); and as their μάντις he performed that office (ἐμαντεύετο: cp. μαντευόμενος c. 35 *supra*) for the Confederates (τοῖσι Ἕλλησι).

2. **ἐν τῇ Πλαταιίδι,** more correct than ἐν Πλαταιῇσι c. 35 *supra*; cp. cc. 15, 25 *supra*.

Ἕλλησι καλὰ ἐγίνετο τὰ ἱρὰ ἀμυνομένοισι, διαβᾶσι δὲ τὸν
37 Ἀσωπὸν καὶ μάχης ἄρχουσι οὔ. Μαρδονίῳ δὲ προθυμεομένῳ
μάχης ἄρχειν οὐκ ἐπιτήδεα ἐγίνετο τὰ ἱρά, ἀμυνομένῳ δὲ καὶ
τούτῳ καλά. καὶ γὰρ οὗτος Ἑλληνικοῖσι ἱροῖσι ἐχρᾶτο, μάντιν
ἔχων Ἡγησίστρατον ἄνδρα Ἠλεῖόν τε καὶ τῶν Τελλιαδέων

3 ἱερὰ A 37. 1 προθυομένωι CP, van H.: προθυμένω B 3 οὔτω C || ἐχρέετο Pz: ἐχρέατο aC 4 τελλαδέων B

3. **καλὰ ἐγίνετο τὰ ἱρά**: the imperfect is significant, and is followed by the conditions above stated. The phrase is the best paraphrase of the term *καλλιρέειν*, cp. c. 19. 5 *supra*.

ἀμυνομένοισι, 'if and so long as they acted on the defensive, and refrained from crossing the Asopos, and delivering an attack.' The participle here is equivalent to a conditional sentence. The Asopos clearly was between the two armies; cp. c. 30 *supra*. The Hellenic forces had advanced down from the *ὑπωρέη*, putting themselves in battle-array, into 'the second position,' with the object of inducing the Persian forces to cross the Asopos, a manœuvre which they could hardly carry out without some disorder. In their actual position the Greeks were probably not directly exposed to the cavalry; it was with the barbarian foot that they wished to engage. To cross the Asopos would have exposed them to the Persian cavalry, and would probably have been absolutely fatal. Teisamenos understood that well enough.

37. 1. **προθυμεομένῳ μάχης ἄρχειν.** This assertion may rest on a genuine tradition, and the fact remains that Mardonios did finally begin the decisive battle. Good reasons for his desire are not far to seek:—(i.) He was the aggressor, the invader, and the initiative naturally lay with him. (ii.) His own reputation was at stake, and there was opportunity for great distinction. (iii.) A victory in the field was desirable, (1) to impress his allies, (2) to secure his rear and communications, (3) perhaps to ease the situation in Asia and especially to recall the Greek fleet. (iv.) A Persian victory at Plataia would virtually cancel Salamis, disrupt the Greek alliance, and probably lead to the submission of the Hellenes. (v.) He had succeeded in drawing the Peloponnesians beyond the Isthmos, and on to a terrain of his own selection (cp. c. 13 *supra*). (vi.) Delay was in their favour, and they were receiving reinforcements daily; thus a quick decision was desirable from his point of view. Mardonios, however, evidently respected his adversaries, and wished to fight the battle on his own terms. He was all but as unwilling as the Greeks themselves to cross the Asopos, at the point which they had selected for defence—*τὸν Ἀσωπὸν τὸν ταύτῃ ῥέοντα* c. 31—and having drawn them beyond the Isthmos, and over Kithairon, and even down to the river bank, he may well have hoped to induce them to cross the stream. In the sequel, indeed, he seems to have attempted to push, or sweep them over it from behind, by sending his cavalry round the hills, on which they were posted, and cutting them off from their water-supply in the rear. Their retreat surprised him, far more than their further advance would have done; and finally lured him across the river, with disastrous results.

2. **ἐπιτήδεα**, 'suitable thereto,' i.e. to beginning battle. The adverb is used c. 7 *supra* in a more absolute way.

3. **Ἑλληνικοῖσι ἱροῖσι ἐχρᾶτο**: an admission which goes to show how little the Persian war was a religious crusade against the idolatrous Greeks! Cp. 8. 109. 15 *supra*. Mardonios is especially philhellenic in these respects, cp. 8. 133.

4. **Ἡγησίστρατον**: a name of good omen on either side, and strangely enough, at this same moment, in full operation in the Greek fleet, cp. c. 91 *infra*. Like Teisamenos, the diviner on the Greek side c. 33 *supra*, Mardonios' diviner is an Eleian, but of another mantic family or clan, the Telliads, founded or represented by that Tellias who had wrought the Thessalians woe, in the service of the Phokians, 8. 27. There was probably a very pretty rivalry between the Iamid on the national side and the Telliad on the Persian.

ἐόντα λογιμώτατον, τὸν δὴ πρότερον τούτων Σπαρτιῆται λαβόντες ἔδησαν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ὡς πεπονθότες πολλά τε καὶ ἀνάρσια ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κακῷ ἐχόμενος, ὥστε τρέχων περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς πρό τε τοῦ θανάτου πεισόμενος πολλά τε καὶ λυγρά, ἔργον ἐργάσατο μέζον λόγου. ὡς γὰρ δὴ ἐδέδετο ἐν ξύλῳ σιδηροδέτῳ, ἐσενειχθέντος κως σιδηρίου ἐκράτησε, αὐτίκα δὲ ἐμηχανᾶτο ἀνδρηιότατον ἔργον πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν· σταθμησάμενος γὰρ ὅκως ἐξελεύσεταί οἱ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ

---

6 <*τὴν*> *ἐπὶ* Werfer, van H. || *τε* om. R 7 *ὑπ᾽* : *πρὸς* malit Kallenberg 8 *πησόμενος* Marc. *z* 9 *ἐδέετο* R(V) 10 *ἐσενεχθέντος* **B** || *κω* C 11 *δὴ* **B** (*αὐτικαδὴ* S) || *ἀνδρεώτατον* Marc. : *ἀνδρειότατον* ceteri (*ἀνδρηιώτατον* van H.) || *πάντων ἔργον* **B**

---

5. **πρότερον τούτων.** Hdt. expressly dates the origin of the feud between Hegesistratos and the Spartans before *τὰ Πλαταιικά*, but he does not explain its origin, nor how Hegesistratos came to leave Tegea for the Persian camp; nor what became of him between the battle of Plataia and his arrest in Zakynthos. Hdt. possibly starts this story with an anachronism; the great enmity of the Spartans for Hegesistratos may only date from his medism, and his capture at Plataia, his escape from Sparta, have been subsequent to that event. If he was following his father's career in central Greece, there is no difficulty in understanding how he came to be diviner to Mardonios. Could he ever have given the Spartans greater cause of offence?

6. **ἔδησαν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ**: cp. 3. 119 *ἔδησε τὴν* (sc. *δέσιν*) *ἐπὶ θ.* There would be some form of trial before sentence was actually pronounced, or carried out (was the *Gerousia* the court? Cp. Aristot. *Pol.* 2. 9. 25 = 1270B, 3. 1. 10 = 1275B, of course under presidency of the Ephors).

ὡς πεπονθότες . . ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. It is a weak point in the story that the injuries inflicted by Hegesistratos upon the Spartans are not specified. The conjecture that he had acted as diviner to the Tegeatai in a war with Sparta (Stein) assumes that there had just been such a war, and also that it would have been lawful to put him to death on such a charge, which is hardly tenable. A charge of 'medism' would be another matter, cp. 7. 214. But his offence was manifold (**πολλά**)!

7. **ἀνάρσια**: c. 110 *infra*.

ὑπό, with a neuter verb, as often; cp. 5. 61 *ὑπὸ Βοιωτῶν ἀναχωρέουσι*, etc.

ἐν τούτῳ τ. κακῷ ἐχόμενος: cp. *ἐν θώματι ἐνέχεσθαι* *infra*, and *ἀπορίῃσι ἐνέχεσθαι* 8. 52. Here, however, the situation is more definitely material.

ὥστε = *ἅτε*: cp. 5. 101 *ὥστε τὰ περιέσχατα νεμομένου τοῦ πυρός*, 6. 44 *ὥστε γὰρ θηριωδεστάτης ἐούσης τῆς θαλάσσης ταύτης κτλ.*

8. **τρέχων περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς**: cp. 8. 102 *δραμέονται περὶ σφέων αὐτῶν*, 7. 57 *περὶ ἑωυτοῦ τρέχων*.

πρό τε τοῦ θανάτου: i.e. he was prepared to undergo a good deal rather than die, to escape death; before, instead of death: on this *πρό* cp. cc. 139, 157 *supra*.

9. **λυγρός** is a decidedly poetical word.

μέζον λόγου, 'beyond description,' 'too great for words'—as we too say, when about to describe anything!

10. **σιδηροδέτῳ**: which explains why he could not cut the stocks to pieces. Cp. story of Kleomenes 6. 75, which may also suggest how Hegesistratos managed to possess himself of a knife. **σιδήριον**: 7. 18 in a somewhat different sense.

11. **πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν**: a mere formula; cp. 8. 105, 124, c. 64 *infra*, etc.

12. **σταθμησάμενος** (*σταθμέομαι*, or *-άομαι*: on the form *σταθμωσάμενος* cp. Veitch, *Verbs*, *sub v.*): he might in this case actually 'measure,' or merely 'calculate'; 'weigh' he could not.

ἐξελεύσεται: of course 'out of the stocks.'

ποδός, ἀπέταμε τὸν ταρσὸν ἑωυτοῦ. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσας, ὡς φυλασσόμενος ὑπὸ φυλάκων, διορύξας τὸν τοῖχον ἀπέδρη ἐς Τεγέην, τὰς μὲν νύκτας πορευόμενος, τὰς δὲ ἡμέρας καταδύνων ἐς ὕλην καὶ αὐλιζόμενος, οὕτω ὥς Λακεδαιμονίων πανδημὶ διζημένων τρίτῃ εὐφρόνῃ γενέσθαι ἐν Τεγέῃ, τοὺς δὲ ἐν θώματι μεγάλῳ ἐνέχεσθαι τῆς τε τόλμης, ὁρῶντας τὸ ἡμίτομον τοῦ ποδὸς κείμενον, κἀκεῖνον οὐ δυναμένους εὑρεῖν. τότε μὲν οὕτω διαφυγὼν Λακεδαιμονίους καταφεύγει ἐς Τεγέην ἐοῦσαν οὐκ ἀρθμίην Λακεδαιμονίοισι τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον· ὑγιὴς δὲ γενόμενος καὶ προσποιησάμενος ξύλινον πόδα κατεστήκεε ἐκ τῆς

13 αὐτοῦ? Stein^2: del. Krueger, van H. || ὥστε **β**, Holder, van H. 16 ὥστε **β**P, Stein^1, Holder, van H. || πανδημεὶ **β**CPz, Stein 17 θώυματι Pz, Stein^1 18 τε: τότε **β** || ὁρέοντας Pz, Stein^1, van H.: ὁρέωντας C 19 τοῦτο κείμενον z 20 καταφεύγειν R(V) 22 ἐκ: ἐπὶ C

13. **τὸν ταρσόν** would, strictly speaking, be only the flat or fore-part of the foot, cp. 8. 12, but he must have cut off rather more than that. Did he not amputate his foot at the ankle? And had he only one foot in the stocks? Or did the liberation of one foot enable him to withdraw the other also? These diviners were perhaps not merely 'medicine-men,' but something of 'surgeons' (as well as comparative anatomists, from their extispications!).

14. **διορύξας τὸν τοῖχον**: no doubt merely a mud wall, or built of adobes. He might use the same knife as he had used for the operation on his foot.

16. **αὐλιζόμενος**: sc. *ἐν αὐτῇ*. For the verb cp. c. 93 *infra*.

πανδημὶ διζημένων: there was a hue and cry raised after him; *πανδημί* does not necessarily imply an expedition under arms. The verb *δίζημαι* is of frequent occurrence in Hdt. and is not to be confounded with the rarer *δίζω*, *δίζομαι*.

17. **τρίτῃ εὐφρόνῃ**. Tegea is only about thirty miles from Sparta, but Hegesistratos will have had to go a good deal out of the direct road, travel only in the dark, and with a bad wound.

τοὺς δέ, as though *αὐτὸν μέν* had preceded, which must indeed be understood before *γενέσθαι*.

18. **ἐνέχεσθαι**: cp. l. 7 above. Not quite exact is the co-ordination of the two points, or causes, of their astonishment, viz. his hardihood in amputating his foot, and his success in escaping. **τὸ ἡμίτομον**: cp. 7. 39. (But would he have surprised them less if he had not left it about?)

20. **ἐοῦσαν οὐκ ἀρθμίην Λακεδαιμονίοισι**. Tegea was at war with Sparta not so very long after *τὰ Πλαταιικά*: cp. c. 34 *supra*, and in some ways, as already shown, the later feud between Tegea and Sparta would suit very well the story of Hegesistratos, except so far as the words **πρότερον τούτων** up above may be held to bar the way. If Tegea was at war with Lakedaimon before the Persian invasion, of which no other record survives, then this feud should have been noticed in 7. 145 as one of those composed in 481 B.C. If so, the reconciliation did not extend to the Eleian diviner; the Spartans were already provided with Teisamenos. Might they not have had Hegesistratos on easier terms? Was Teisamenos himself at all responsible for their implacable hostility to the Telliad?

22. **προσποιησάμενος ξύλινον πόδα**: he did not make his wooden foot with his own hands, but probably employed a statuary. Artificial limbs were apparently unusual (except as *ex voto* offerings).

κατεστήκεε . . πολέμιος: he took his stand, took up a hostile attitude; or simply 'became'; for the verb cp. c. 70 *infra*.

ἐκ τῆς ἰθέης, 'openly,' *palam*; sc. *ὁδοῦ* or *τέχνης*: cp. c. 57 *infra*. Had he ever pretended friendship for them?

ἰθέης Λακεδαιμονίοισι πολέμιος. οὐ μέντοι ἔς γε τέλος οἱ συνήνεικε τὸ ἔχθος τὸ ἐς Λακεδαιμονίους συγκεκυρημένον· ἥλω γὰρ μαντευόμενος ἐν Ζακύνθῳ ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπέθανε.

38 *Ὁ μέντοι θάνατος ὁ Ἡγησιστράτου ὕστερον ἐγένετο τῶν Πλαταιικῶν, τότε δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ Μαρδονίῳ μεμισθωμένος οὐκ ὀλίγου ἐθύετό τε καὶ προεθυμέετο κατά τε τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ κατὰ τὸ κέρδος. ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἐκαλλιέρεε ὥστε μάχεσθαι οὔτε αὐτοῖσι Πέρσῃσι οὔτε τοῖσι μετ᾽ ἐκείνων ἐοῦσι Ἑλλήνων (εἶχον γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι ἐπ᾽ ἑωυτῶν μάντιν Ἱππόμαχον Λευκάδιον ἄνδρα), ἐπιρρεόντων δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων*

---

23 *ἰθείης* codd. *z* || *γε ἐς* **B**, Gaisford 24 *συγκεχωρησμένον* R: *συγκεχωρημένον* SV : *συγκεκρημένον* Reiske, Holder, van H. **38.** 1 *μέντοι*: *μέν νυν* **B**, Holder 2 *δ᾽* CP*z*, van H. || *τῷ Μαρδονίῳ* *z* 3 *ὀλίγῳ* S || *προθυμέετο* **a**C (*προεθυμεῖτο* van H.) || *τε τὸ*: *τὸ* **B**P*z* || *τὸ*: *τῶν* R 4 *ἐκαλλιέρει* van H. 7 *ἐπιρεόντων* **a**, Holder

---

23. **ἐς τέλος**, ‘finally,’ ‘at last.’

24. **συνήνεικε**: sc. *ἐς τὸ ἄμεινον*, ‘went well,’ was successful; cp. 8. 87 where the word is used absolutely, as here; followed in c. 88 by *συνήνεικε αὐτῇ ἐς εὐτυχίην*.

† **συγκεκυρημένον**: the passive form is unique and constitutes a difficulty; it can hardly be right, though Schweighaeuser ingeniously gets the idea of ‘mutuality’ (*mutuum odium*) out of it. Eltz thought that the reading of S was a correction of the true reading *συγκεκρημένον* which Reiske conjectured afterwards; cp. App. Crit.

25. **μαντευόμενος**, ‘acting as diviner’ (cp. c. 36. 2 *supra*), but not necessarily in battle; it was this assumption of mantic functions apparently which gave such great offence in Sparta: that he had prostituted his art in the service of Persia might be his chief offence.

ἐν Ζακύνθῳ: what would be the date of his arrest in Zakynthos? Schoell dated it to the second summer of the Peloponnesian war, cp. Thuc. 2. 66, which would give Hegesistratos indeed a long life! Busolt, iii. 1. 123, places it with more probability just after the battle of Dipaia. Fugitives from Sparta naturally went west; Demaratos had been overtaken in Zakynthos (6. 70 *supra*) but not extradited; Themistokles started in the same direction, Thuc. 1. 136.

ἀπέθανε: sc. *ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν*; cp. 1. 7 *supra*.

38. 2. **ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ**: cp. c. 30 *supra*. Mardonios and the Greeks are both ‘on the Asopos,’ but on different sides of it.

μεμισθωμένος οὐκ ὀλίγου: there was nothing peculiar in this circumstance; no doubt all the diviners were largely remunerated, though to the discredit of Hegesistratos alone is it mentioned that he prostituted the diviner's office for ‘hate and greed.’

4. **οὐκ ἐκαλλιέρεε ὥστε μάχεσθαι**: i.e. *οὐκ ἐγίνετο καλὰ τὰ ἱρά*, cp. c. 36 *supra*; *μάχεσθαι* must here = *μάχης ἄρχειν*, otherwise there is a slight discrepancy between c. 37 *ad init.* and this place. Perhaps the signs as divined by Hippomachos were against fighting *simpliciter*; while Hegesistratos modified his divination to the extent above implied.

6. **ἐπ᾽ ἑωυτῶν**: cp. c. 17 *supra*.

7. **Ἱππόμαχον Λευκάδιον ἄνδρα.** Hippomachos of Leukas is the least distinguished of the diviners, and Hdt. has nothing to tell of him. His fellow-citizens are fighting in the ranks of the confederate Greeks; cp. c. 28 *supra*. (The name is not as common as might be expected, appearing first as that of a Trojan, *Il.* 12. 189, and again as one of the Thirty at Athens in 404 B.C., Xenoph. *Hell.* 2. 3. 2, 2. 4. 19.)

ἐπιρρεόντων: cp. *Il.* 11. 724 *ἐπέρρεον ἔθνεα πεζῶν*.

καὶ γινομένων πλεύνων, Τιμηγενίδης ὁ Ἕρπυος ἀνὴρ Θηβαῖος συνεβούλευσε Μαρδονίῳ τὰς ἐκβολὰς τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος φυλάξαι, λέγων ὡς ἐπιρρέουσι οἱ Ἕλληνες αἰεὶ ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέρην καὶ
39 *ὡς ἀπολάμψοιτο συχνούς. ἡμέραι δέ σφι ἀντικατημένοισι ἤδη ἐγεγόνεσαν ὀκτώ, ὅτε ταῦτα ἐκεῖνος συνεβούλευε Μαρδονίῳ. ὁ δὲ μαθὼν τὴν παραίνεσιν εὖ ἔχουσαν, ὡς εὐφρόνη ἐγένετο, πέμπει τὴν ἵππον ἐς τὰς ἐκβολὰς τὰς Κιθαιρωνίδας αἳ ἐπὶ*

8 *καὶ <ἀεὶ> γινομένων* Naber, Holder : *καὶ γινομένων <αἰεὶ>* van H. || *τιμογενίδης* **a**C(Pz) 9 *κιθερῶνος* **a** 10 *ἐπιρέουσι* **a**, Holder || *αἰεὶ* del. van H. 11 *ἀπολάμψαιτο* **B** **39.** 3 *εὐέχουσαν* A 4 *ἐσβολὰς* R : *ἐμβολὰς* SMarc.

8. **Τιμηγενίδης ὁ Ἕρπυος**: this man appears below, cc. 86, 87, with Attaginos, as leader of the medizing faction in Thebes; he doubtless held the post of 'Boiotarch,' cp. c. 16 *supra*. The name appears as Τιμηγενίδας in Pausan. 7. 10. 2 (who has nothing new to say of him); the proper form was presumably Τιμαγενίδας (or Τειμαγενίδας?). The name Τιμαγένης is not uncommon, but Timagenidas is only borne by the Theban traitor. His father's name, Herpys (Reptile!), is no less unique.

The notion that Mardonios was put up to employing his cavalry on the Greek flank and lines of communication by Timagenidas is probably a popular fiction. The Persian was, indeed, unworthy of his position, if he had to be coached in the very rudiments of warfare by a Boiotian.

9. **τὰς ἐκβολὰς τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος.** Hdt. nowhere betrays any clear consciousness that there was more than one pass over Kithairon; but cp. next chapter. The plural ἐκβολαί is without prejudice, as Hdt. uses the plural (e.g. 7. 176) of a single route. ἐσβολή, not ἐκβολή, is, however, the usual term; the word here seems appropriate from the supposed speaker's point of view. Neither Timagenidas nor Mardonios could have any pass now in view but the main route over Kithairon to Eleutherai. The Eleutherai-Plataia road was merely a branch of this; the Plataia-Megara road was high on the mountain, very rough and inaccessible for cavalry, and doubtless, like the previously named one, covered by the Greeks. But in moving from their first position at Erythrai the Greeks had opened up the main road (Thebes-Erythrai-Eleutherai), perhaps relying upon their supplies coming *via* Hysiai and Plataia. The Persian cavalry could now ride freely up the hill past Erythrai; and once up there might even sweep to the west along the road to Hysiai, to Plataia, and so on. If Mardonios had moved west with a view to out-flanking the Greek left, he seems now preparing a diversion on their right.

It is conceivable that the advance of the Greeks from the position 'at Erythrai' to the position 'on the Asopos' was encouraged or enforced by the pressure of the Persian cavalry. It is even conceivable that Hdt.'s chronology, or sequence of events, is here at fault, and that it was this very exploit of the cavalry, here recorded, which induced the Greeks to advance down from the ὑπωρέη on to the Asopos-ridge.

φυλάξαι, 'to occupy in force.'

11. **ἀπολάμψοιτο**: an unusual form; cp. 3. 146 ἀπολάμψεσθαι.

39. 1. **ἡμέραι δέ σφι . . ὀκτώ.** *Prima facie* this means that eight days had elapsed since the two armies came into position opposite one another ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ or in the second position; cp. cc. 30, 31 *supra*. The δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ in that position has been already noted, c. 33 *supra*. So long a delay as that without any exchange of hostilities, or any attempt on the part of the Persian cavalry either to cut off supplies or to harass the Greeks in this advanced position, seems improbable. The situation would be eased if we might substitute or add the (indefinite) number of days spent in the first position, and its development. It may, however, fairly be doubted whether the Diary of Plataia is to be taken quite seriously in its numbering of days; cp. Appendix VIII. § 2.

4. **τὰς ἐκβολὰς τὰς Κιθαιρωνίδας αἳ ἐπὶ Πλαταιέων φέρουσι,** 'the pass over

Πλαταιέων φέρουσι, τὰς Βοιωτοὶ μὲν Τρεῖς κεφαλὰς καλέουσι, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ Δρυὸς κεφαλάς. πεμφθέντες δὲ οἱ ἱππόται οὐ μάτην ἀπίκοντο· ἐσβάλλοντα γὰρ ἐς τὸ πεδίον λαμβάνουσι

7 *ἐσβαλόντα* **B** || *εἰς* R

Kithairon leading in the direction of Plataia.' Only one pass is indicated; but it is one leading, not to Erythrai, or Thebes, nor to Hysiai, but 'towards Plataia.' Where it leads from Hdt. does not expressly signify; ultimately no doubt from the Peloponnesos, but by which route? It is hardly conceivable that exactly the same route is signified by this description as the route by which in c. 19 *supra* the confederate forces marched from Eleusis to Erythrai. But the route to Plataia from Eleusis (and so from Athens, or the Peloponnese) is virtually the same, except in its last stage, where it breaks away to the west before descending the gorge to Erythrai, skirts the further side of the ridge for a short distance, and comes out through a distinct gap, possibly covered by Hysiai, and so down over the *ὑπωρέη* to Plataia. It may be this loop to the west which is here intended. The Persian cavalry could gain it by riding up the road past Erythrai into the hills, and then turning to the right. That would be the pass leading from Eleutherai (etc.) to Plataia.

The mere words in the text would also apply to the pass leading direct to Plataia from Megara, west of the pass just described; but that pass was a difficult one, entirely unsuited to cavalry operations, or even to the Greek commissariat service. Stein[5] thinks that *de facto* this was the pass here in question, though he does not identify it with Dryoskephalai. If so Hdt. would have used this term quite wrongly.

The further designations for the pass in question may be held to support the view above adopted.

5. **Τρεῖς κεφαλὰς . . Δρυὸς κεφαλάς.** The Boiotians had one name for the pass, the Athenians another; it was a pass then used by Athenians, which rules out the Megara-Plataia pass. Moreover Thucydides proves the point: 3. 24. 1 *ἑώρων τοὺς Πελοποννησίους τὴν πρὸς Κιθαιρῶνα καὶ Δρυὸς κεφαλὰς τὴν ἐπ' Ἀθηνῶν φέρουσαν μετὰ λαμπάδων διώκοντας.* The Peloponnesians in that case had started from their lines round Plataia. (Even if *τὴν ἐπ' Ἀθ. φ.* were a gloss, the argument remains, and the identification of Dryoskephalai with the pass to Megara cannot be entertained. Baehr, note *ad l.*, ascribes this identification to Leake and Vischer, and Leake's map of Plataia, though not his text, lays him open to the charge, of which Vischer, *Erinnerungen* pp. 533, 540, appears innocent, as he certainly identifies the 'Three Heads' pass with the route from Eleutherai. An explanation of the term 'Three Heads' may be found in the supposition that it applied primarily to the meeting-place, or junction of the three roads, from Eleutherai, from Erythrai (Thebes), from Plataia. Goettling suggested that the spot was marked by a *triceps Hermes*, hence the *Τρεῖς κεφαλαί*: cp. Baehr *in l.* Vischer's idea that the name is due to the appearance of three mountain tops (*Kuppen*) from the Boiotian side overhanging the pass is less happy. Why the Athenians preferred the term 'Oak's Heads' is not recorded; Baehr suggests that it applied to the route from the Athenian side, which wound up through forests of oak (till it reached the top, or 'head' ?).

7. **ἐς τὸ πεδίον**: this term cannot be quite accurately used in this place, even if **ἐσβάλλοντα** is given a highly inceptive or imperfect sense; for the objective of the commissariat train would hardly be *τὸ πεδίον*.

Five hundred beasts of burden would be a fairly large train: they were no doubt sumpter, not draft animals. They were coming from Peloponnesos, for Attica and Megara could furnish nothing after their devastation, cc. 13, 14 *supra*; but they were coming, not by the difficult Megara-Plataia route, but by the better road *via* Eleusis and Eleutherai. The attendants may have been Helots, at least in part. The story implies that there was no armed convoy, and no resistance (but some of the *Agogiates* would surely have escaped). The train may have been approaching Plataia at night (see above) to escape notice from the Persians, and it may have been this device, or practice, that was reported to Mardonios by his Theban friends. The terms in which Hdt. records this exploit

ὑποζύγιά τε πεντακόσια, σιτία ἄγοντα ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσου ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον, καὶ ἀνθρώπους οἳ εἵποντο τοῖσι ζεύγεσι· ἑλόντες δὲ ταύτην τὴν ἄγρην οἱ Πέρσαι ἀφειδέως ἐφόνευον, οὐ φειδόμενοι οὔτε ὑποζυγίου οὐδενὸς οὔτε ἀνθρώπου. ὡς δὲ ἄδην εἶχον κτείνοντες, τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτῶν ἤλαυνον περιβαλόμενοι παρά τε Μαρδόνιον καὶ ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον.

40 *Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον ἑτέρας δύο ἡμέρας διέτριψαν, οὐδέτεροι βουλόμενοι μάχης ἄρξαι· μέχρι μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Ἀσωποῦ ἐπήισαν οἱ βάρβαροι πειρώμενοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, διέβαινον δὲ οὐδέτεροι. ἡ μέντοι ἵππος ἡ Μαρδονίου αἰεὶ προσέκειτό τε καὶ ἐλύπεε τοὺς Ἕλληνας· οἱ γὰρ Θηβαῖοι, ἅτε μηδίζοντες μεγάλως, προθύμως ἔφερον τὸν πόλεμον καὶ αἰεὶ κατηγέοντο*

9 οἱ R 11 οὐ om. **B***z*, van H.: num glossema οὐ . . ἀνθρώπου deleveris? 12 ἄδην: ἄδε S || αὐτέων *z* || περιβαλλόμενοι Marc. *z* (παραβαλόμενοι C) 13 παρά τε om. C: τε om. **a** **40.** 3 ἐπήεισαν Marc. || πειρεόμενοι van H. 6 προθύμως <τε> ? Stein[2] || ἐφέροντο πόλεμον C

by the cavalry are not very 'convincing': the Persians would hardly have killed the beasts for pure love of slaughter, like a mad Aias, but presumably captured as many as possible, with the stores.

10. **ἄγρην** is rather a sporting word; cp. 1. 73, 2. 70, 3. 129.

11. **οὐ φειδόμενοι . . ἀνθρώπου** looks like a gloss: *ἀφειδέως* is used without explanation in 1. 163, 207, but I will not argue from that to the earlier composition of this passage!

12. **ἄδην εἶχον**: an adverbial construction, cp. Plato *Rep.* 541 B. (Schweighaeuser's *Lex.* treats *ἄδη* as a subst.)

περιβαλόμενοι: cp. 8. 8.

40. 1. **ἑτέρας δύο ἡμέρας**: i.e. 9th and 10th. The **ἔργον**, or furious slaughter of slave and beast (not without misplaced irony!) had taken place on the night of the 8th.

διέτριψαν, 'wasted'—a little hard upon them, especially on the Persian cavalry, which, though neither side wished *μάχης ἄρξαι* (a pitched battle), did some useful skirmishing, as is immediately admitted.

2. **μέχρι . . τοῦ Ἀσωποῦ ἐπήισαν.** Mardonios apparently drew out his men, day by day, on the left bank of Asopos, opposite the Greek Laager, and by sending his cavalry round their position tried to draw and drive them north across the Asopos.

5. **οἱ γὰρ Θηβαῖοι κτλ.** The passage exhibits a manifest animus against the Thebans, who were medizing 'wholesale' (**μεγάλως**). Hdt., following no doubt a vicious source, Attic or phil-Attic, represents the Thebans as heading 'Persians and Medes,' until it came to actual fighting (**μέχρι μάχης**), and then leaving it to the 'barbarian' cavalry to do all the derring deeds (**ἀρετάς**). In reality no doubt the Theban, Thessalian and Makedonian cavalry on the right of the Persian line rode round the Athenians on the left wing, even as the Medo-Persian cavalry on the left rode round the Lakedaimonians on the Greek right, and the two may have met about the springs of Gargaphia; it is possible, however, that the Greek left, on higher ground, or less concerned for Gargaphia, suffered less from the medizing Greeks than the Greek right from the Persians. Only the Thebans are mentioned here: with Thessalians and Makedonians the Athenians were afterwards on better terms.

It is not very likely that the Greeks had been eight days in the second position ('on the Asopos') before Mardonios adopted these very obvious tactics; nor again very likely that he owed their adoption to Theban suggestion.

6. **ἔφερον τὸν πόλεμον**: cp. c. 18 *supra.*

κατηγέοντο: sc. *τῇ ἵππῳ.* Cp. c. 104 *infra*, 7. 183 *supra.*

μέχρι μάχης, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου παραδεκόμενοι Πέρσαι τε καὶ Μῆδοι μάλα ἔσκον οἳ ἀπεδείκνυντο ἀρετάς.

Μέχρι μέν νυν τῶν δέκα ἡμερέων οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλεῦν ἐγίνετο **41**
τούτων· ὡς δὲ ἐνδεκάτη <σφι> ἐγεγόνεε ἡμέρη ἀντικατημένοισι ἐν Πλαταιῇσι, οἵ τε δὴ Ἕλληνες πολλῷ πλεῦνες ἐγεγόνεσαν

---

8 *μάλιστα* **B**: *καλὰ* C 3 *ἐν* : *ἀλλήλοισι ἐν* z

41. 2 *τουτέων* z || <*σφι*> Stein(2) 3

---

7. **μέχρι μάχης κτλ.** is not inconsistent with *οὐδέτεροι βουλόμενοι μάχης ἄρξαι* above, which plainly refers to a general or pitched battle.

τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου παραδεκόμενοι: in a somewhat different sense 1. 18 *παραδεξάμενος παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν πόλεμον προσεῖχε ἐντεταμένως.* Still more, 2. 166 *τὰ ἐς πόλεμον ἐπασκέουσι μοῦνα παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεκόμενος.* Cp. also 1. 102 *παρεδέξατο τὴν ἀρχήν.* In all those cases the predecessor has done what the successor is doing. *ἐκδέκεσθαι* is the commoner verb with Hdt. Cp. 7. 211. 2 (*ὑποδέκεσθαι* c. 21. 15 *al. sens.*).

8. **μάλα ἔσκον**: the verb has the frequentative form; cp. 7. 119. *μάλα* is the positive of *μᾶλλον* and *μάλιστα*, and seems here to have a corrective, adversative, or intensive signification, differentiating still more emphatically the action of the Persians from that of the Thebans. It is comparatively rare with verbs: 1. 93 *θώματα δὲ γῆ ἡ Λυδίη ἐς συγγραφὴν οὐ μάλα ἔχει*, 1. 134 *οἱ δὲ* (sc. *ἄρχουσι*) *μάλα τῶν ἐχομένων*, 1. 181 *ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πύργῳ ἄλλος πύργος ἐπιβέβηκε, καὶ ἕτερος μάλα ἐπὶ τούτῳ*, where it very nearly = *αὖθις* or *πάλιν*. Cp. also 7. 11, 186, etc.

ἀρετάς: a significant plural; not a number of different virtues, but a number of cases of one virtue (courage): 'derring deeds.' Cp. 1. 176 *Λύκιοι δὲ . . ἐπεξιόντες καὶ μαχόμενοι ὀλίγοι πρὸς πολλοὺς ἀρετὰς ἀπεδείκνυντο.*

41. 1. **τῶν δέκα ἡμερέων**: viz. the eight days specified in c. 39 and the two days specified in c. 40 *supra*. With 'ten days,' however, we reach the suspicious Hellenic 'week,' out of which the previous smaller items may have been extracted! A good deal had happened on the eighth, ninth, tenth, and even on the second (c. 33 *supra*). It is hardly credible that from the third to the eighth (at sundown) the Greeks had been allowed to occupy their (second) position absolutely unmolested, or that, if molested, as on the ninth, tenth, and twelfth (the eleventh is dropped by Hdt. from this point of view, and devoted to the conference between Mardonios and Artabazos), they could have held out, without either crossing the Asopos to do battle, or retreating to some third position, better protected from the cavalry. In other words, it is very unlikely that so many days elapsed in 'the second position' as Hdt. asserts.

οὐδὲν . . τούτων is a formula; cp. 9. 121, 6. 42.

2. **ὡς δὲ ἐνδεκάτη ἐγεγόνεε ἡμέρη**, 'when the eleventh day was come' (not 'was past'): sc. the eleventh day on which the two armies were facing each other **ἐν Πλαταιῇσι**, i.e. no doubt according to Hdt.'s conception 'in the second position,' *ἐν τῇ Πλαταιίδι, ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ*, cp. cc. 25, 30, 31, 36 *supra*. But, even if the chronological index is to be taken quite strictly, the topographical or enchorial index may admit of being stretched a little further, so that *ἐν Πλαταιῇσι* should not merely equal *ἐν τῇ Πλαταιίδι*, but cover the ground of all the operations in Boiotia antecedent to the battle. The word, indeed, as here used, **ἀντικατημένοισι ἐν Πλαταιῇσι**, applies to the Persians equally with the Greeks, yet the Persians were on the other side of the Asopos, which was not even Plataian land.

3. **πολλῷ πλεῦνες ἐγεγόνεσαν**: this assertion cannot be taken to mean that the numbers given above in c. 30 had by this time been largely exceeded. Hdt. was bound in his muster-roll to give the maximal estimates, and the figures there given must be taken to cover the accessions here recorded. But the apparent inconsequence shows that strict order of time or argument cannot be assumed in Hdt.'s methods of exposition, and entitles his readers to a certain liberty of readjustment, whether in the logical or in the chronological interest.

καὶ Μαρδόνιος περιημέκτεε τῇ ἕδρῃ, ἐνθαῦτα ἐς λόγους ἦλθον Μαρδόνιός τε ὁ Γοβρύεω καὶ Ἀρτάβαζος ὁ Φαρνάκεος, ὃς ἐν ὀλίγοισι Περσέων ἦν ἀνὴρ δόκιμος παρὰ Ξέρξῃ. βουλευομένων δὲ αἵδε ἦσαν αἱ γνῶμαι, ἡ μὲν Ἀρταβάζου ὡς χρεὸν εἴη

---

4 *περιημέκτεε . . Μαρδόνιος* om. R 5 *γοβρύεω* PMarc., Stein : *Γωβρύω* van H. : *γωβρύεω* 6 *βουλομένων* **B** 7 *ἔσαν* z || *μὲν γὰρ* **B** || *χρεὼν* CPz, van H.

---

4. **Μαρδόνιος περιημέκτεε τῇ ἕδρῃ**: for the verb cp. 8. 109; for the construction rather 4. 154. *ἕδρη* is a quasi-military term; cp. *ἀντικατῆσθαι* above, Thuc. 5. 7. 2. But here it means perhaps little more than 'delay' (*διατριβή*, cp. *διέτριψαν* c. 40).

ἐς λόγους ἦλθον, 'had a conversation,' or conference together. The parties to such a proceeding would be more or less co-ordinate (like two Roman consuls commanding different armies); nevertheless, on the present occasion, it appears that in some way or other the authority of Mardonios was superior to that of Artabazos; moreover the conference is not a private dialogue, but apparently a council of war, at which all the chief officers in the army, or armies, are present—though Hdt. is not clear or explicit on this point. How purely rhetorical or stylistic the use of the patronymic may be is clearly shown in the present case; cp. 7. 11 etc. For Gobryas cp. 7. 2, 5 etc.; for Pharnakes 8. 126.

5. **ἐν ὀλίγοισι**: cp. 4. 52.

6. **βουλευομένων**, not merely the two Persians just named, but all those present at the Council, who have two *γνῶμαι* laid before them, that of Artabazos, supported by the Thebans, and that of Mardonios (which probably commended itself to his Persian officers).

7. **ἡ μὲν Ἀρταβάζου.** The plan of Artabazos is to abandon operations in the field, to evacuate the fortified camp, to retire behind the walls of Thebes, and from there—whither it might be expected the Greek army would follow—to attempt by bribery and corruption the realization of the Persian hopes. This record is remarkable for several reasons.

(i.) It implies that there were serious misgivings on the Persian side as to the issue of a battle.

(ii.) It suggests that the forward movement of the Greeks and their occupation of the second position gave them some advantage, perhaps threatened the Persian position more directly than Hdt. appears to realize. As against this, however, it seems improbable that the tradition, so favourable to the Greeks, and especially to the Athenians, should have quite forgotten, or missed, so important a point in their favour.

(iii.) Artabazos cannot be exonerated from the suspicion of viewing Mardonios with jealousy, and subordinating the Persian interest to personal schemes and rivalries. The story of his subsequent action or inaction is astounding. The technical relation between the two generals is obscure; see below; but, whatever it was, Artabazos comes badly out of the affair in the sequel, notwithstanding a pretty evident bias in his favour.

(iv.) The plan proposed by Artabazos, as far as negotiations, bribery and so forth are concerned, had already been tried; cp. notes to c. 4 *supra*. It is said to be supported by the Thebans; it is indeed their own original idea, cp. c. 2 *supra*; but the time has surely gone by for it now, with the confederate army in position before them. If there was a medizing party in the Athenian camp (Plutarch *Arist.* 13) there was an Atticizing section on the other side of the Asopos! cp. c. 44 *infra*.

(v.) The idea of retiring into Thebes is not a sound one, though the proposal is valuable as implying comparatively small numbers on the Persian side. Artabazos might, indeed, have acquired a respect for Greek fortifications from his own failure before Poteidaia (8. 126-9), but a siege of Thebes could hardly have been to the advantage of the besieged: the Persian cavalry would have been lost; the abandonment of the Persian camp on the Asopos was morally tantamount to a defeat.

(vi.) Hdt. places this debate on the 11th day. But this date may be merely a dramatic ruse. The difference of

ἀναζεύξαντας τὴν ταχίστην πάντα τὸν στρατὸν ἰέναι ἐς τὸ τεῖχος τὸ Θηβαίων, ἔνθα σῖτόν τέ σφι ἐσενηνεῖχθαι πολλὸν καὶ χόρτον τοῖσι ὑποζυγίοισι, κατ' ἡσυχίην τε ἰζομένους διαπρήσσεσθαι ποιεῦντας τάδε· ἔχειν γὰρ χρυσὸν πολλὸν μὲν ἐπίσημον πολλὸν δὲ καὶ ἄσημον, πολλὸν δὲ ἄργυρόν τε καὶ ἐκπώματα· τούτων φειδομένους μηδενὸς διαπέμπειν ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, Ἑλλήνων *δὲ μάλιστα ἐς τοὺς προεστεῶτας ἐν τῇσι*

---

8 *ἀναζεύξαντες* C 9 *θηβαῖον* RV ‖ *τέ* om. S ‖ *ἐνηνέχθαι* RS : *συνενηνεῖχθαι* Cobet 10 *διαπρήσεσθαι* C 12 *δὲ καὶ ἄργυρόν* CPz ‖ *τε* om. S : ‘*τε καὶ ἐκπώματα* suspecta’ Stein^2 13 *τουτέων* z : *τούτων δὲ* **B**

---

opinion between Artabazos and Mardonios will not then first have occurred, or come to light. It was probably of longer standing. What line had Artabazos taken when the policy was originally proposed by the Thebans, c. 3 *supra*? Hdt. may have crystallized and misdated a long standing feud and difference of opinion. Or has Artabazos and his *corps d'armée* only just joined Mardonios? He has had the whole summer for his march from Poteidaia, and Mardonios has already offered battle.

(vii.) At this point there are perhaps two alternatives recognizable, one or other of which Artabazos might have advocated. (*a*) A tactical stratagem. Mardonios himself was anxious to draw the Greeks across the Asopos: why not retire on Thebes, abandoning even the camp, with its plate and spoil, for the nonce, in order to get the Greeks across the river, and to bring about a general engagement (cp. Hannibal's ruse, Livy 22. 41 f.)? (*b*) A strategic coup. Artabazos may have proposed what he himself afterwards carried out, retreat, the evacuation of Boiotia, perhaps of Greece, the preservation of their two armies intact for the king's service. Artabazos has a special loyalty to Xerxes. Events in Asia (movement of the Greek fleet, revolt of Babylon, etc.) may already have been reported at Persian headquarters in Boiotia. Such tactics or such strategy Mardonios rejected: the first might easily prove a failure; the second was failure confessed. The time for political and diplomatic manœuvring had gone. Under the circumstances, with the available evidences, one's sympathies in this debate must be with Mardonios.

8. **ἀναζεύξαντας**: cp. 8. 60; but the verb here governs *π. τ. στρατόν*, if the words are genuine.

τὴν ταχίστην: sc. *ὁδόν*. The phrase suggests a longer march than just back to Thebes; but it may well be taken with *ἀναζεύξαντας* and = *ὡς τάχιστα*. Still, where was the need of hurry?

τὸ τεῖχος τὸ Θηβαίων. Thebes was a walled city; cp. c. 86 *infra*. If the whole army was going to find accommodation in Thebes it cannot have numbered 300,000. Even 150,000 men would have strained the accommodation! But perhaps the northern Greeks were expected to go home; Artabazos himself may also have no intention of remaining in Boiotia. Thebes might have accommodated 50,000 men—Mardonios' *corps d'armée*—as well as its own population.

The statement that there was abundance of food for man and beast (**σῖτος, χόρτος**) will be contradicted, within twenty-four hours, by Alexander of Makedon, c. 45 *infra*; but it is probably true for all that. Cp. notes *ad l.*

9. **ἐσενηνεῖχθαι** is of course pl.p.

10. **διαπρήσσεσθαι**: obviously of political intrigue; the active is used, not so very differently, c. 94 *infra.*

13. **φειδομένους μηδενός**, ‘without stint’ (Macaulay), i.e. = *ἀφειδέως*; cp. c. 39 *supra*.

διαπέμπειν: distributively. Why suspect the plate? Rather than that insert *πολλά*—it was no doubt of gold and silver. Cp. 3. 148, and c. 80 *infra*.

14. **τοὺς προεστεῶτας**: not necessarily the formally appointed magistrates, or commanders, but the political leaders; *προστάται*, cp. 5. 23, 49, etc.

πόλισι, καὶ ταχέως σφέας παραδώσειν τὴν ἐλευθερίην· μηδὲ ἀνακινδυνεύειν συμβάλλοντας. τούτου μὲν ἡ αὐτὴ ἐγίνετο καὶ Θηβαίων γνώμη, ὡς προειδότος πλεῦν τι καὶ τούτου, Μαρδονίου δὲ ἰσχυροτέρη τε καὶ ἀγνωμονεστέρη καὶ οὐδαμῶς συγγινωσκομένη· δοκέειν τε γὰρ πολλῷ κρέσσονα εἶναι τὴν σφετέρην στρατιὴν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς, συμβάλλειν τε τὴν ταχίστην μηδὲ περιορᾶν συλλεγομένους ἔτι πλεῦνας τῶν συλλελεγμένων, τά τε σφάγια τὰ Ἡγησιστράτου ἐᾶν χαίρειν μηδὲ βιάζεσθαι,

42 ἀλλὰ νόμῳ τῷ Περσέων χρεωμένους συμβάλλειν. τούτου δὲ οὕτω δικαιεῦντος ἀντέλεγε οὐδείς, ὥστε ἐκράτεε τῇ γνώμῃ· τὸ

---

15 προδώσειν Naber 16 ἀνακινδυνεύσειν idem, van H. || συμβαλόντας S || μέν νυν z || ἐγένετο z 18 τε om. **β**: τε καὶ ἀγνωμονεστέρη om. C || συγγιγνωσκομένη **a**: συγγινωσκομένου van H. 19 κρέσσονας **a**pr: κρέσσον CV 20 στρατηΐην RS 21 πλεῦνας γίνεσθαι z || συλλεγομένων A^1Pz 22 βιᾶσθαι van H. 23 χρεομένους P, van H.

---

15. **παραδώσειν**: euphemistically for *προδώσειν*.

16. **ἡ αὐτὴ ἐγίνετο καὶ Θηβαίων γνώμη**: (his opinion) was the same as that of the Thebans—i.e. as expressed above in c. 2. Hdt. does not mean to say that the Thebans now expressed their opinion.

17. **ὡς προειδότος πλεῦν τι**: it is rather insight than foresight, perhaps, which the phrase is meant to suggest.

Μαρδονίου δέ: sc. *ἡ δὲ γνώμη Μαρδονίου ἦν* (ellipse, or brachylogy). It follows in *orat. obliq.* Hdt. apparently means to condemn it, as 'stark, obstinate, uncompromising'—i.e. utterly devoid of reasonableness, of the spirit of compromise. On *ἀγνωμοσύνη* cp. c. 3 *supra*. **πολλῷ κρέσσονα** corresponds with the figures as given by Hdt. (350,000 *v.* 110,000), but if true of the real numbers would somewhat have mitigated the apparently 'foolish obstinacy' of Mardonios. If tradition had been content to state the figures of Mardonios' force more accurately, his obstinacy might have seemed less reasonable.

20. **συμβάλλειν** may be constructed with *ὡς χρεὸν εἴη* or such like, understood out of *ἡ γνώμη ἦν*, but a looser construction, or apposition, were no less idiomatic.

τὴν ταχίστην = *ὡς τάχιστα*: sc. *συμβολήν*, *ὁδόν*, or *sim.*; cp. 1. 8 *supra*.

21. **περιορᾶν**: i.e. *pati*, cp. 7. 16.

τά τε σφάγια . . ἐᾶν χαίρειν: this sentiment sounds, and is intended to sound, very impious and shocking, though as coming from a Persian it might be less offensive than in the mouth of a Greek; but then, Mardonios should not have had recourse to Hellenic divination if he was going to flout it in this fashion! χ. *ἐᾶν*, cp. c. 45 *infra*, 4. 112 *supra*.

22. **βιάζεσθαι**: *vim inferre auspiciis*, Baehr; *permittere ut victimae sibi vim afferant*, Matthiae: the one taking the verb as deponent trans., the other as passive. Both uses are found: Soph. *Antig.* 66 *βιάζομαι τάδε* (pass.), Thuc. 8. 53. 2 *τοὺς νόμους βιασάμενος* (as here *τὰ σφάγια*). So also with personal object. In a rather different sense, which might however work here, Thuc. 4. 11. 4 *βιαζομένους τὴν ἀπόβασιν*, 7. 72. 3 *βιάσασθαι . . τὸν ἔκπλουν*. Stein notes that *ἐκβιάζεσθαι* would have been clearer.

23. **νόμῳ τῷ Περσέων**: i.e. it was not the Persian custom to submit military tactics to the chances of divination. There is something of a problem here. Persians were probably as superstitious, to say the least of it, as Greeks. The (apparent) absence of the Magi in the army of Mardonios is remarkable. He himself is represented as the special fautor of Greek religion. He here appears in the character of a 'freethinker,' like Claudius Pulcher in 249 B.C. before the battle of Drepana; cp. Suetonius, *Tib.* 2.

42. 2. **δικαιεῦντος**: a favourite word with Hdt. = *ἀξιοῦν*, cp. 8. 126.

γὰρ κράτος εἶχε τῆς στρατιῆς οὗτος ἐκ βασιλέος, ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀρτάβαζος. μεταπεμψάμενος ὦν τοὺς ταξιάρχους τῶν τελέων καὶ τῶν μετ' ἑωυτοῦ ἐόντων Ἑλλήνων τοὺς στρατηγοὺς εἰρώτα εἴ τι εἰδεῖεν λόγιον περὶ Περσέων ὡς διαφθερέονται ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι. σιγώντων δὲ τῶν ἐπικλήτων, τῶν μὲν οὐκ εἰδότων

---

42. 3 ἐκ βασιλέως C: ἐκ βασιλῆος *z*: om. **B**, Valla: 'nec fortasse genuina' van H. 4 τούς τε ταξιάρχους τῶν μετ' ἑωυτοῦ ἐόντων Ἑλλήνων καὶ malit Stein[5] 5 ἠρώτα CP*z* 6 εἰδοῖεν *z* || διαφθερέονται P: διαφθορεῦνται **B**: διαφθερέοντας Paris. 1635 *z*: διαφθαρέονται

ὥστε, 'and so,' cp. 7. 118.

τὸ γὰρ κράτος εἶχε κτλ.: the statement that Mardonios but not (**ἀλλ' οὐ**) Artabazos was commander-in-chief of the army by the king's commission (**ἐκ**), still leaves the exact relations of Mardonios and Artabazos an obscure problem. (*a*) 8. 126 *supra* looks as though Artabazos held a post directly subordinate to Mardonios, inasmuch as he was in command of 60,000 of Mardonios' own select soldiers; but that passage is not convincing, and if 300,000 is really the figure, not for the force of Mardonios but for the king's grand army itself (cp. c. 32 *supra*), the passage must really tell quite the other way. (*b*) The service on which Artabazos is there engaged points to an independent command, as does also (*c*) his subsequent conduct towards Mardonios c. 66 *infra*, and (*d*) the reception which he afterwards enjoys at home; had he been in a position actually subordinate to Mardonios his reception could hardly have been so good. Moreover (*e*) this passage itself, closely considered, lends weight to the supposition that the two commanders were independent of each other; Hdt. at any rate has avoided saying that Artabazos had to take his orders from Mardonios. Is it not possible that the exact position of neither general is fully or clearly stated? Was the command of Artabazos primarily a command in Thrace, and the command of Mardonios a command in Hellas, south of Olympos? Was Mardonios at least more than mere 'commander'? was he governor, or satrap of Hellas, for the time being? His Greek 'allies' (cp. cc. 31, 32 *supra*) were certainly the king's subjects. It was only their presence which gave the army of Mardonios its numerical superiority to that of Artabazos. Mardonios is perhaps to be thought of as defending his own province from an Hellenic invasion!

4. **μεταπεμψάμενος ὦν**: so far the two Persian commanders have been having a private conversation; but that implication is in itself improbable, and conflicts with other indications in the text, viz. (*a*) the set speech ascribed to Artabazos; (*b*) the term βουλευομένων above; (*c*) the purely inadequate and dummy rôle assigned to the ἐπίκλητοι when now at last summoned; (*d*) the obvious probability, and indeed certainty, that the commander would confer with his officers. We may fairly conclude that the Council has really been sitting through c. 41, or at least that the arguments already given represent speeches made at the Council, even if the two chiefs had previously held a private colloquy.

τοὺς ταξιάρχους τῶν τελέων: the term τελέαρχος (cp. τελάρχης) is hardly found; the 'taxiarchs,' or captains, of the τέλη, or squadrons, are here apparently the Persian and other native officers, cp. 8. 67, the ἄρχοντες of the army-list in Bk. 7, cp. 7. 81, as distinguished from the Strategoi of the Greeks, i.e. the Boiotarchs, the Aleuadai, Alexander of Makedon, Harmokydes the Phokian, and so forth.

5. **εἰρώτα εἴ τι κτλ.**: this inquiry by Mardonios would have been singularly tactless in form and in substance, if it had really been addressed to the officers above indicated, Persian as well as Greek, summoned *ad hoc*. 'Know ye any prediction that we Persians are to be utterly destroyed here in Hellas?' Stein[5] accordingly would emend the passage, cp. App. Crit. But did Hdt. reason so closely?

7. **τῶν ἐπικλήτων**: well rendered by Macaulay, 'those summoned to council,' cp. 7. 8, 8. 101. The general, or

τοὺς χρησμούς, τῶν δὲ εἰδότων μὲν ἐν ἀδείῃ δὲ οὐ ποιευμένων τὸ λέγειν, αὐτὸς Μαρδόνιος ἔλεγε "ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ὑμεῖς ἢ ἴστε οὐδὲν ἢ οὐ τολμᾶτε λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐρέω ὡς εὖ ἐπιστάμενος· ἔστι λόγιον ὡς χρεόν ἐστι Πέρσας ἀπικομένους ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα

8 ἀδείαι P 9 αὐτός τε **B**: αὐτός γε Gomperz, Holder || Μαρδόνιος ἔλεγεν· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐρέω ὡς εὖ ἐπιστάμενος, ἐπεὶ δὴ ὑμεῖς ἢ ἴστε κτλ. S || ἡμεῖς C 11 χρεών CPz || ἐστι: τι **B**

governor, has his *ἐπίκλητοι*, like the king. (The word cannot here be evacuated of meaning, or reduced to *ἐπικληθέντων* or *ἐπικλήτων γενομένων*.) The Persians (**τῶν μέν**) would mostly be ignorant of the Greek oracles, the Greeks (**τῶν δέ**) might know them, but 'did not consider it safe' (**ἐν ἀδείῃ δὲ οὐ ποιευμένων**) to say so.

9. **αὐτὸς Μαρδόνιος ἔλεγε**: did he speak in Persian, or in Greek? The speech ascribed to him still further complicates the situation. 'There is a prophecy to the effect that the Persians after coming to Greece must sack the temple in Delphi, and thereafter perish to the last man. We shall not sack the temple: as far as that is concerned, then, we are safe enough.' Mardonios might have gone on to show some positive cause for expecting a victory; he has done that (privately!) already to Artabazos, viz. (1) the Persian army is superior to the Greek; (2) there is no time to be lost, for the Greek army is increasing day by day; (3) it is the Persian way to assume the offensive, to deliver the attack.

The present anecdote has very little to say to the situation at Plataia; it is not so much part of the story of Plataia, as part of the Apology of Delphi. It explains the fact—a fact so very awkward for Delphi by and by—that Delphi escaped pillage at the hands of the Persians. The explanation is good in itself, but it is completely at variance with the other and more brilliant explanation and apology already given, viz. the story of the Persian attack on Delphi, and the miraculous preservation of the temple and its contents, 8. 35–39. Both stories cannot be true, though both may be false. To suppose that if the Persians, a year before, had done their best to plunder Delphi, Mardonios would have urged this line of argument, in order to cheer and encourage his Council of War, is absurd (the rather, as the Delphic god takes the will for the deed, 6. 86). But this critique might only be one point more against the story in Bk. 8, in itself already incredible. Is the story here true? It is improbable. Its apologetic tendency condemns it. The improbability of the Persian commander-in-chief urging such a line of argument in any case remains. Hdt. himself adds that there was no such oracle: the oracle cited he refers to another connexion. Last, not least, considering the real situation in 480–79 B.C., there is hardly room or occasion for such an oracle, much less for such a scene in the Persian camp as this anecdote involves; it is, in the truest sense, a huge anachronism. Delphi, if not actually on the Persian side, was on the side of the Greeks who were on the Persian side, cp. 7. 132. The question of a Persian sack of Delphi can hardly have been a real question at the time; Xerxes and Mardonios were more likely to be making offerings at Delphi—like Datis at Delos in 490 B.C., cp. 6. 97—than plundering the shrine. It may fairly be concluded that this anecdote, though not involving physical impossibilities, is not more true, in a strictly historical sense, than the other.

11. **λόγιον** is *prima facie* a prose utterance (yet cp. *πεποιημένον* in next c.); the oracle, then, will hardly be a Delphic response. It cannot, however, be (as Stein suggests) due to Onomakritos (cp. 7. 6), for he communicated no oracle *σφάλμα φέρον τῷ βαρβάρῳ*. Mardonios might be supposed to have had it through Mys his commissioner. Cp. 8. 133 ff. Baehr points out that Euripides, *Bacch.* 1336, has this oracle (or this anecdote?) in view: *ὅταν δὲ Λοξίου χρηστήριον διαρπάσωσι, νόστον ἄθλιον πάλιν σχήσουσι* (sc. *οἱ βάρβαροι*). If so, he has 'harmonized' it with the story in 8. 35 ff. Here there is no *νόστος*.

χρεόν ἐστι after *ἔστι λόγιον* is a little curious and clumsy: if maintained,

διαρπάσαι τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι, μετὰ δὲ τὴν διαρπαγὴν ἀπολέσθαι πάντας. ἡμεῖς τοίνυν αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐπιστάμενοι οὔτε ἴμεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἱρὸν [τοῦτο] οὔτε ἐπιχειρήσομεν διαρπάζειν, ταύτης τε εἵνεκα τῆς αἰτίης οὐκ ἀπολεόμεθα. ὥστε ὑμέων ὅσοι τυγχάνουσι εὔνοοι ἐόντες Πέρσῃσι, ἥδεσθε τοῦδε εἵνεκα ὡς περιεσομένους ἡμέας Ἑλλήνων.” ταῦτά σφι εἴπας δεύτερα ἐσήμαινε παραρτέεσθαί τε πάντα καὶ εὐκρινέα ποιέεσθαι ὡς ἅμα ἡμέρῃ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ συμβολῆς ἐσομένης.

43 *Τοῦτον δ' ἔγωγε τὸν χρησμόν, τὸν Μαρδόνιος εἶπε ἐς Πέρσας ἔχειν, ἐς Ἰλλυριούς τε καὶ τὸν Ἐγχελέων στρατὸν οἶδα πεποιημένον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐς Πέρσας. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν Βάκιδι ἐς ταύτην τὴν μάχην [ἐστὶ] πεποιημένα,*

---

12 *ἁρπαγὴν* **B** 13 *οὗτοι τε* z 14 *τοῦτο* Stein, van H.: om. **B**, Holder: seclusi 15 *ταύτῃι* C 17 *περισομένους* R: *περιεζομένους* SV 18 *ἐσήμενε* R: *ἐσήμηνε* SV || *εὐρικρενέα* B: *εὔκρινα* S 19 *συμβουλῆς* R **43.** 2 *τῶν* **B** || *ἐγχελέων* R: *ἐγχέλεον* B: *ἐγχέλεων* 3 *τάδε μὲν* **B** 4 *ἐστὶ* post *Βακίδι* z: om. C, Gaisford, van H.: secl. Stein[2], Holder

---

it would show that the original significance of *χρεών* was virtually forgotten. But alas for thee, Mardonios! *οὔτε ἐς τὸ μετέπειτα οὔτε ἐς τὸ παραυτίκα νῦν καταπροΐξεαι ἀποτράπων τὸ χρεὸν γενέσθαι* (cp. 7. 17).

15. **ταύτης τε εἵνεκα τῆς αἰτίης** seems to admit that there might be other grounds for apprehension—which Mardonios would of course, if this story were true, have proceeded to remove. Cp. *τοῦδε εἵνεκα* just below.

18. **εὐκρινέα ποιέεσθαι**: apparently in a physical, not a merely psychical sense. Our naval order 'to clear the decks for action' is superficially analogous. Xenophon, *Oikon.* 8. 19, makes Ischomachos say that 'there should be a place for everything and everything in its place,' *ὅτι καὶ χύτρας φημὶ εὔρυθμον φαίνεσθαι εὐκρινῶς κειμένας.*

19. **ἡμέρῃ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ**: i.e. the 12th. Cp. c. 41 *supra.*

43. 1. **ἐς Πέρσας ἔχειν**, 'to apply to the Persians'; cp. 6. 19.

2. **ἐς Ἰλλυριούς τε καὶ τὸν Ἐγχελέων στρατὸν οἶδα πεποιημένον**, 'I know to have been composed (in verse) with reference to Illyrians, that is to say, the Enchelean host.' 'Encheleus' was apparently (according to Appian, *Illyr.* 2) the eldest son of Illyrios. The 'Encheleis' are mentioned 5. 61 as a folk among whom the 'Kadmeians' took refuge when driven out of Thebes by the Argives, 'in the days of Laodamas son of Eteokles.' Pausanias too (9. 5. 3) represents Kadmos himself as having retired to dwell among the Illyrian tribe of Encheleans, leaving the Theban throne to his son Polydoros. Strabo 326 places the *Ἐγχέλειοι, οὓς καὶ Σεσαρηθίους καλοῦσι*, in the *Hinterland* of Epidamnos and Apollonia, and adds that *ἐν τοῖς Ἐγχελείοις οἱ Κάδμου καὶ Ἁρμονίας ἀπόγονοι ἦρχον καὶ τὰ μυθευόμενα περὶ αὐτῶν ἐκεῖ δείκνυται.* Apollodoros (3. 5. 4) gives the story of Kadmos. The 'Encheleis' were at war with the 'Illyrians,' and had an oracular promise of victory if they took Kadmos and Harmonia as leaders: they obeyed and obtained victory. Subsequently, however, Kadmos and Harmonia were metamorphosed into serpents. This is the story utilized by Euripides, where he shows acquaintance with the oracle as interpreted by Hdt. in this place; cp. *Bakchai* (ed. Sandys) 1330–1339. For **οἶδα** here see below.

3. **τὰ μὲν Βάκιδι**: sc. *ἔπη*. On Bakis cp. 8. 20. The *μέν* here has no corresponding *δέ*. So too *ταῦτα μέν* just below.

4. **ταύτην τὴν μάχην** is curious, as it apparently refers to the battle of Plataia, still to come.

τὴν δ' ἐπὶ Θερμώδοντι καὶ Ἀσωπῷ λεχεποίῃ
Ἑλλήνων σύνοδον καὶ βαρβαρόφωνον ἰυγήν,
τῇ πολλοὶ πεσέονται ὑπὲρ λάχεσίν τε μόρον τε
τοξοφόρων Μήδων, ὅταν αἴσιμον ἦμαρ ἐπέλθῃ,—

ταῦτα μὲν καὶ παραπλήσια τούτοισι ἄλλα Μουσαίῳ ἔχοντα οἶδα ἐς Πέρσας. ὁ δὲ Θερμώδων ποταμὸς ῥέει μεταξὺ Ταναγρῆς τε καὶ Γλίσαντος.

44 *Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπειρώτησιν τῶν χρησμῶν καὶ παραίνεσιν τὴν ἐκ Μαρδονίου νύξ τε ἐγίνετο καὶ ἐς φυλακὰς ἐτάσσοντο. ὡς δὲ πρόσω τῆς νυκτὸς προελήλατο καὶ ἡσυχίη τε ἐδόκεε*

---

5 *θερμόδοτον* R 7 *πολλὴ* **B** (*πολλῇ* ap. Gaisf.) || *λάχεσί* RV 8 *ἔσιμον* B 9 *τούτοισι* om. S || *Μουσαίου* Bekker **44.** 1 *ἐπηρώτησιν* C 2 *ἐγένετο* Sz 3 *προσελήλατο* **B** || *ἡσυχίη τε* **B**, Stein[3] : *ἡσυχίηι* B : *ἡσυχίη*

---

5. **λεχεποίῃ** of the Asopos is Homeric: *Il.* 4. 383.

6. **σύνοδον**: cp. c. 27 *supra.*

ἰυγή is a rare word, found also *ap.* Soph. *Philok.* 741; cp. verb *ἰύζειν* *Tr.* 784. The Homeric form is *ἰυγμός*, *Il.* 18. 572.

7. **ὑπὲρ λάχεσίν τε μόρον τε**, 'beyond what destiny and fate decree.'—'Lachesis' does not appear in Homer; but *ὑπὲρ μόρον* is Homeric, *Od.* 1. 34.

8. **αἴσιμον ἦμαρ**: *Homerum quoque redolet*, Baehr; cp. *Il.* 8. 72, etc.

9. **Μουσαίῳ**: cp. 7. 6 *supra.*

10. **οἶδα**: cp. 1. 3 *supra.* The two are remarkable, the rather as they hardly refer to exactly the same kind of knowledge. Had Hdt. in his hands a MS. copy of the poems and prophecies of Musaios, or whence his assurance of personal knowledge in this case? His assertion that the prediction (said to have been) referred by Mardonios to the Persians in truth referred not to them but to the Encheleians is a question of interpretation. Here we may suppose an antecedent visit to Delphi, and even the correction of a previous error. This chapter has many marks of being an insertion, an interpolation: if from the author's own hand, then not as part of the first or original draft of the work; cp. Introduction, § 9. Two further points are of special interest in regard to the *λόγιον*. (1) It is an 'unfulfilled' prophecy; a prophecy, indeed, designed to defeat its own fulfilment. (2) It exhibits the possibility and the practice of transferring predictions from one event to another as might suit.

ὁ δὲ Θερμώδων κτλ.: the geographical gloss is added to explain the name in the oracle above. On the river cp. c. 27 *supra.* Plutarch (*Dem.* 19, cp. *Theseus* 27) shows that the 'Sibylline' verse *τῆς ἐπὶ Θερμώδοντι μάχης ἀπάνευθε γενοίμην* could be interpreted of the battle of Chaironeia, in 338 B.C. On Tanagra cp. c. 15 *supra.*

11. **Γλίσαντος.** Glisas appears in the Catalogue (*Il.* 2. 504) in one line with Plataia. Its ruins are placed by Pausanias (9. 19. 2) off the road from Thebes to Chalkis, seven stades to the north of Teumesos, under Mount Hypatos. It was famous as the scene of a battle between the Argives, i.e. Epigonoi, and the Thebans (1. 44. 4 etc.). Pausanias names the Thermodon beside it. Cp. Strabo 412 *Γλίσαντα δὲ λέγει κατοικίαν ἐν τῷ Ὑπάτῳ ὄρει . . πλήσιον Τευμησσοῦ . . ᾧ ὑποπίπτει τὸ Ἀόνιον καλούμενον πεδίον.*

44. 1. **τὴν ἐπειρώτησιν τῶν χρησμῶν**: a curious expression, for 'inquiry about, or after, the oracles'—referring to Mardonios' inquiry in c. 42 *supra.* For the word cp. 6. 67. The **παραίνεσις** is also to be found in c. 42 *supra.*

2. **νύξ τε . . καὶ . .**: a very simple parataxis, cp. 7. 21.

ἐς φυλακὰς ἐτάσσοντο apparently applies to both sides, and means practically that they retired to quarters, bivouacked, instead of continuing in battle-array, *φυλακή* being guard-duty, etc. Cp. also c. 51 *infra*, and here just below. On the division of the watches see note to c. 51 below.

3. **πρόσω τῆς νυκτὸς προελήλατο**: a

εἶναι ἀνὰ τὰ στρατόπεδα καὶ μάλιστα οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι ἐν ὕπνῳ, τηνικαῦτα προσελάσας ἵππῳ πρὸς τὰς φυλακὰς τὰς Ἀθηναίων Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἀμύντεω, στρατηγός τε ἐὼν καὶ βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων, ἐδίζητο τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν. τῶν δὲ φυλάκων οἱ μὲν πλεῦνες παρέμενον, οἳ δ' ἔθεον ἐπὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς, ἐλθόντες δὲ ἔλεγον ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἥκοι ἐπ' ἵππου ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου τοῦ Μήδων, ὃς ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν παραγυμνοῖ ἔπος, στρατηγοὺς δὲ ὀνομάζων ἐθέλειν φησὶ ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν. οἳ δὲ ἐπεὶ ταῦτα ἤκουσαν, αὐτίκα εἵποντο **45**

5 τὰς Ἀθηναίων: τῶν Ἀθηναίων Pz 8 δ': δὲ **B** 10 ἥκει Marc. z 11 ἐθέλειν σφι C: ἐθέλει σφίσιν Marc.: ἐθέλει φησὶ z **45.** 1 ἕποντο CPz

neuter construction, with a correct temporal pluperfect: *multum noctis processerat.* Cp. 2. 121 ὡς δὲ πρόσω ἦν τῆς νυκτός. Copied by Sallust, *Iug.* 21 *ubi plerumque noctis processit.* The whole phrase **ὡς δὲ . . ἐν ὕπνῳ** is a paraphrase for 'the second watch,' cp. c. 51 *infra.*

5. **τὰς φυλακὰς τὰς Ἀθηναίων**: the feminine φυλακή may be either collective (cp. ἡ ἵππος) or local; the plural here suits the latter meaning: the outposts, vedettes. Cp. 1. 2 *supra.*

6. **Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἀμύντεω κτλ.** If the patronymic might have been employed here for the sake of clearness and style, yet the full description added is rather *de trop*, after the many previous accounts of Alexander (7. 173–5, 8. 34, 136 ff., cc. 1, 4, 8 *supra*), and points rather to the independent Attic, or phil-Attic source, from which this part of the narrative is obviously derived. The Makedonians were posted on the Persian right, opposite the Athenians; cp. c. 31 *supra.*

7. **ἐδίζητο**: cp. c. 37 *supra.*

τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι: in spite of c. 28 *supra* Alexander knows that there is more than one Strategos in the Athenian quarters. Stein says, 'probably all ten were in camp, cp. 6. 103'—but what then of Xanthippos, and his probable colleague, or colleagues, on the fleet? (cp. c. 114 *infra*). And was there no Strategos left in Salamis?

ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν: he wishes to communicate, to converse with them, but there is no question of a discussion or a debate, cp. c. 41 *supra.*

8. **τῶν δὲ φυλάκων**: the good, efficient, vigilant, shrewd Athenian picket! Most of them stay—to keep an eye on Alexander (whom they did not recognize), while two or three ran (**ἔθεον**) to headquarters with the message. Probably there was an officer who gave the proper directions, and the action was not all quite so spontaneous and democratic as it reads.

9. **ἄνθρωπος** is not complimentary to the king: it suggests a barbarian. Perhaps οἱ ἄνθρωποι up above has a special reference to the same side, whose vigilance Alexander had of course *ex hypothesi* to avoid; or it might contrast with the beasts, who were perhaps awake, but did not matter.

11. **παραγυμνοῖ**: cp. 8. 19.

στρατηγοὺς δὲ ὀνομάζων: certainly not all ten of them, but a selection! If only Hdt. had done as much! The only Strategoi for this year whom he names are Aristeides (c. 28 *supra*) and Xanthippos (c. 114 *infra*). Plutarch (*Aristeid.* 20) adds for Plataia two names, Leokrates and Myronides. It is hardly likely that Aristeides was but τρίτος αὐτός with so large a force under arms. The Athenian democratic theory was that all battles were soldiers' battles, and that generals did not count for much, and needed not to be remembered, unless they were killed. Where was Themistokles, for example, all this time? Was he with Xanthippos on the fleet? Thuc. 1. 90 disproves it. Was he with Aristeides in the camp? Was he in Salamis with the women and children? The Athenians forgot to say—forgot even to say whether he was one of the Strategoi this year at all.

45. 1. **οἳ δέ**: the two, three, or more, 'named' by Alexander. It is not said

ἐς τὰς φυλακάς· ἀπικομένοισι δὲ ἔλεγε Ἀλέξανδρος τάδε. " ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, παραθήκην ὑμῖν τὰ ἔπεα τάδε τίθεμαι, ἀπόρρητα ποιεύμενος πρὸς μηδένα λέγειν ὑμέας ἄλλον ἢ Παυσανίην, μή με καὶ διαφθείρητε· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔλεγον, εἰ μὴ μεγάλως ἐκηδόμην συναπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος. αὐτός τε γὰρ Ἕλλην γένος εἰμὶ τὠρχαῖον καὶ ἀντ' ἐλευθέρης δεδουλωμένην οὐκ ἂν ἐθέλοιμι ὁρᾶν τὴν Ἑλλάδα. λέγω δὲ ὦν ὅτι Μαρδονίῳ τε καὶ τῇ στρατιῇ τὰ σφάγια οὐ δύναται καταθύμια γενέσθαι· πάλαι γὰρ ἂν ἐμάχεσθε. νῦν δέ οἱ δέδοκται τὰ μὲν σφάγια ἐᾶν χαίρειν, ἅμ' ἡμέρῃ δὲ διαφωσκούσῃ συμβολὴν ποιέεσθαι·

---

2 *δὴ* S 3 *τάδε τὰ ἔπεα* **ß** || *τίθημι* Marc. 5 *καὶ* om. CPz || *οὐ δὲ γὰρ* z 7 *ἐλευθερίης* Marc. 8 *ἕλοιμι* **ß** || *δὴ* Krueger 10 *δέ οἱ* om. R || *μὲν τὰ* RV (*μὲν* om. S ap. Gaisf.) 11 *ἅμα* **ß**, Holder, van H. || *διαφωσκούσηι* A^2: *διαφασκούσηι* A^1B: *διαφαυσκούσῃ* reliqui, Holder || *συμβουλὴν* **ß**

---

they had to be roused. Everything is wide-awake in the Athenian camp.

2. **τὰς φυλακάς** is practically here locative, and feminine, cp. cc. 44. 2, 93. 22.

ἔλεγε Ἀλέξανδρος τάδε. Alexander's address is given in *orat. recta.* It appears to be made up in essentials out of Mardonios' in *orat. obliq.*, c. 41 *supra*; the change is purely stylistic, and the one speech doubtless as unauthentic as the other. If there were anything to choose, it would not be in favour of this one. Alexander is the only speaker at this interview with the Strategoi; they supply a passive audience; it is not a conference, it is a monologue. Alexander may have spoken good Greek, with a Makedonian brogue: a few solecisms in his reported language would have lent it verisimilitude.

3. **ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι**: strictly correct, had he been addressing the *Boule* or *Ekklesia*, as in 8. 140. The *ἄνδρες* gains point from the *ἄνθρωπος* in the previous chapter.

παραθήκην τίθεμαι, 'I deposit,' 'I entrust,' perhaps without recall; cp. 6. 73 *π. παρατίθενται.*

4. **ἀπόρρητα ποιεύμενος**: sc. *τὰ ἔπεα*, 'as a solemn secret'; cp. c. 94 *infra.* **πρὸς μηδένα λέγειν** is exegetical.

ἢ Παυσανίην: Pausanias is here recognized as the sole commander-in-chief. The need for this strict secrecy is not apparent: so long as no one on his own side knew, Alexander was safe. When this story came up Pausanias had been called to his account and was beyond further inquiry (except by necromancy); and as none of the other Greeks had been told of the matter, owing to this solemn precaution, it was no use their saying they had never heard of it! Thus the story provides its own Apologetics!

6. **συναπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος,** 'of Hellas collectively': no mere geographical expression, cp. 7. 157.

αὐτός τε γὰρ Ἕλλην γένος εἰμί: according to the story in 8. 137 and the judgement of the *Hellanodikai* 5. 22. Cp. notes *ad ll.c.*

7. **τὠρχαῖον**: i.e. 'originally'; cp. 1. 56 *τὸ ἀρχαῖον*, 1. 173 *τὠρχαῖον*, etc. Here = *τὰ ἀνεκάθεν.*

8. **(λέγω) δὲ ὦν** resumes or emphasizes the point at which he is driving; cp. 7. 145.

Μαρδονίῳ τε καὶ τῇ στρατιῇ, 'to Mardonios and his army.'

9. **οὐ δύναται,** 'refuse,' 'will not,' 'cannot be got to . .'; cp. 7. 134. A strictly sacral *non possunt.*

καταθύμια: cf. 5. 39, of the heart's desire. An intimate word, warmer than the *καλά, ἐπιτήδεα* of c. 37 *supra.*

10. **γάρ,** '(for) otherwise.'

δέδοκται: the perfect of absolute resolution, determination.

11. **ἅμ' ἡμέρῃ δὲ διαφωσκούσῃ**: i.e. at dawn of day—the 12th day; cp. 3. 86 and c. 42 *supra ad f.*

συμβολὴν ποιέεσθαι: i.e. *μάχης ἄρξαι*, or *ἄρχειν.*

καταρρώδηκε γὰρ μὴ πλεῦνες συλλεχθῆτε, ὡς ἐγὼ εἰκάζω. πρὸς ταῦτα ἑτοιμάζεσθε. ἢν δὲ ἄρα ὑπερβάληται τὴν συμβολὴν Μαρδόνιος *καὶ μὴ ποιέηται, λιπαρέετε μένοντες· ὀλιγέων γάρ σφι ἡμερέων λείπεται σιτία. ἢν δὲ ὑμῖν ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε κατὰ νόον τελευτήσῃ, μνησθῆναι τινὰ χρὴ καὶ ἐμεῦ ἐλευθερώσιος πέρι, ὃς* Ἑλλήνων *εἵνεκα οὕτω ἔργον παράβολον ἔργασμαι ὑπὸ προθυμίης, ἐθέλων ὑμῖν δηλῶσαι τὴν διάνοιαν τὴν* Μαρδονίου, *ἵνα μὴ ἐπιπέσωσι ὑμῖν ἐξαίφνης οἱ βάρβαροι μὴ προσδεκο-*

---

12 *καταρρώιδηκε* P: *καταρρωδήκεε* **B** ‖ *συλλεγῆτε* **B**: *συναχθῆτε* z 13 *ἆρα* AB 14 *καὶ μὴ ποιέηται* del. van H.: *ποιῆται* **B**, Holder ‖ *ὀλίγα* S: *ὀλίγων* ceteri 16 *ἐμὲ* C 17 *ἔργον οὕτω*, Holder, van H.: *τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον οὕτω* z 19 *ἐξαίφνης* om. **B** (*οἱ βάρβαροι ἐξαίφνης* P[1]) ‖ *μὴ* cum rasura P: *μὴ δὲ* Marc.

---

12. **καταρρώδηκε γάρ κτλ.**: a clear assertion or admission of the formidable number of the Greek forces. There was no need for conjecture about the view of Mardonios; he has expressly stated it c. 41 *supra* (*ex hyp.* to Artabazos !).

13. **ἄρα**, 'as is not likely': of the less probable alternative cp. 7. 10, etc.

14. **μὴ ποιέηται**: the negative here seems to coalesce with the verb to form a single idea, the conditional *ἤν* being remote (but not so clearly as in cases where *οὐ* might be used).

λιπαρέετε: a word put again into Alexander's mouth, 5. 19.

ὀλιγέων γάρ σφι ἡμερέων λείπεταὶ σιτία. If this statement were true, it would supply another good ground for the impatience of Mardonios to do battle. It is contrary, and even contradictory, to the statement in c. 41 *supra*, and looks like either a deliberate lie on the part of Alexander (hardly in the spirit of the piece), or an oversight on the part of Hdt. Rawlinson thought this statement could not be true. Stein limits it to 'the magazines on the Asopos,' but admits there was plenty in Thebes. Blakesley refuted this point of contrast by anticipation: "With the superiority in cavalry . . it would have been perfectly easy to maintain uninterrupted communication between Thebes and the army in camp."

15. **ἢν δὲ . . τελευτήσῃ**: an end to the war acceptable to the Greeks was in sight; on the Persian side victory was anything but assured. This is the fifth clear admission of the fact as recognized before the event; cp. cc. 41–42 *supra*. The 'hedging' of Alexander, as a fact, is the real evidence.

16. **τινά**: cp. 8. 109.

ἐλευθερώσιος πέρι: this suggestion that Alexander pleaded beforehand with the Athenians for deliverance from the Persian at their hands is in the true style of Attic afterthought. The Athenians are the 'liberators' from the Persian, and not from the Persian alone, cp. 8. 142. (But in Makedon, or at least in Thrace, the Spartans are by and by to bring 'liberty' from the Athenians; cp. Thuc. 4. 85.)

17. **'Ελλήνων εἵνεκα**: Alexander is moved by the best motives, thinking mainly of the general interests.

οὕτω Stein takes with *παράβολον*, cp. 7. 46, where, however, no word intervenes between *οὕτω* (*bis*) on the one hand and the adjective (and subst.) on the other.

παράβολον: bold, hazardous, reckless. Also of persons, Aristoph. *Wasps* 192, Diodor. 19. 3. 2 *φιλοκίνδυνος . . καὶ παράβολος ἐν ταῖς μάχαις.*

ἔργασμαι ὑπὸ προθ.: cp. c. 37.

18. **διάνοιαν** (cp. 8. 97): the plan to attack on the following morning.

19. **ἵνα μὴ κτλ.** The concern of Alexander lest the Greeks should be taken unawares is a doubtful compliment, and an inconsequence. According to the context, they had been for ten days facing the Persians in battle-array, and anxious that the enemy should cross the Asopos and attack them; on the morrow they were to have their wish at last.

ἐξαίφνης is (1) a doubtful form for *ἐξαπίνης*, as in 1. 74, 87; (2) omitted in

μένοισί κω. εἰμὶ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδών." ὁ μὲν ταῦτα εἴπας ἀπήλαυνε ὀπίσω ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον καὶ τὴν ἑωυτοῦ τάξιν.

46 *Οἱ δὲ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας ἔλεγον Παυσανίῃ τά περ ἤκουσαν Ἀλεξάνδρου. ὁ δὲ τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ καταρρωδήσας τοὺς Πέρσας ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἐς ἠῶ ἡ συμβολὴ γίνεται, ὑμέας μὲν χρεόν ἐστι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους στῆναι κατὰ τοὺς Πέρσας, ἡμέας δὲ κατὰ τοὺς Βοιωτούς τε καὶ τοὺς κατ' ὑμέας τεταγμένους Ἑλλήνων, τῶνδε εἵνεκα· ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε τοὺς Μήδους καὶ τὴν μάχην*

---

21 *ἀπέλαυνεν* **B** **46.** 4 *χρεών* CPz, van H. 5 *τοὺς Ἀθηναίους* abesse malit van H. 6 *τε* om. **a**C 7 *εἵνεκεν* Marc. z || *ἐπίστασθαι* BR

---

one group of MSS.; (3) tautologous and gloss-like in this passage.

20. **εἰμὶ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδών**: Alexander in thus announcing himself appears to forget that Aristeides and the men of Athens were thoroughly familiar with his appearance, if only from his embassy to Athens in the previous winter; cp. 8. 136 ff. The two stories are of course from independent sources (though both Atticist).

The historical credibility of this interview is not high. Certainly, if any such interview or communication took place between Alexander of Makedon and the Athenian Strategoi, the gist and purport of it were widely different from this report. Possibly there was at Plataia some kind of understanding between the Makedonian and the Athenians. He had been to Athens, or to Salamis, a while before, and may have seen reason to think that Mardonios had anything but an easy task before him. To play off the Greeks and the Persians against each other was the obvious policy of Makedon. The Athenians may have used the opportunity to come to an understanding with the king. He may have had information of the troubles in Asia (revolt of Babylon, etc.). The remarkable success with which, in the subsequent battle, the Athenians dispose of 50,000 men opposed to them, and their comparative immunity during the occupation of 'the second position,' suggest the idea that matters were not pressed against them. For that they may have had to thank Alexander, who was posted on the Persian right.

46. 1. **οἱ δὲ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων**: i.e. Aristeides and his colleagues—or so many of them as were present—went to the right wing, the army bivouacking in order of battle. They have cut a very poor figure in the previous interview, acting the part of mere dummies.

2. **Παυσανίῃ**: no account being taken of Euryanax, in spite of c. 10 *supra*. Pausanias is terror-struck at the report! Not a Laconian touch. His speech, like that of Alexander just before, is given in *orat. recta*.

4. **ἐς ἠῶ ἡ συμβολὴ γίνεται**: cp. 3. 85 *τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρης ὁ ἀγὼν ἡμῖν ἐστί*. The present is rhetorical. In this case the argument is double: that the battle is to take place (at dawn) is a reason for the tactical move; that it is not to take place until dawn gives time to execute the proposed manœuvre.

6. **τοὺς . . Ἑλλήνων**: including the Makedonians, whose medism throughout is minimized as much as possible.

7. **τῶνδε εἵνεκα**: the reasons given for the change of front, or exchange of positions, are incredible. The experience of the *Μαραθωνομάχαι*, as a taunt, might have come very well from a Spartan after the vainglorious boasting of the Athenians in c. 27 *supra* (cp. notes *ad l.*), but as a serious argument by a Spartan commander for such a manœuvre as proposed here, it is virtually inconceivable. Nor, on the other hand, could a Spartan have practically ignored the Spartan achievement at Thermopylai as Pausanias here does. True, the Spartans at Thermopylai had all perished (Aristodemos who is at

αὐτῶν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μαχεσάμενοι, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄπειροί τε εἰμὲν καὶ ἀδαέες τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν· Σπαρτιητέων γὰρ οὐδεὶς πεπείρηται Μήδων, ἡμεῖς δὲ Βοιωτῶν καὶ Θεσσαλῶν ἔμπειροι εἰμέν. ἀλλ' ἀναλαβόντας τὰ ὅπλα χρεόν ἐστι ἰέναι ὑμέας μὲν ἐς τόδε τὸ κέρας, ἡμέας δὲ ἐς τὸ εὐώνυμον." πρὸς δὲ ταῦτα εἶπαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τάδε. "καὶ αὐτοῖσι ἡμῖν πάλαι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐπείτε εἴδομεν κατ' ὑμέας τασσομένους τοὺς Πέρσας, ἐν νόῳ ἐγένετο εἰπεῖν ταῦτα τά περ ὑμεῖς φθάντες προφέρετε· ἀλλὰ ἀρρωδέομεν μὴ ὑμῖν οὐκ ἡδέες γένωνται οἱ λόγοι. ἐπεὶ δ' ὦν αὐτοὶ ἐμνήσθητε, καὶ ἡδομένοισι ἡμῖν οἱ λόγοι γεγόνασι καὶ ἕτοιμοι εἰμὲν ποιέειν ταῦτα." ὡς δ' **47**

8 αὐτέων z || ἐν: ἐπὶ Pz 9 τουτέων z || τῶν ἀνδρῶν (-έων V) τουτέων **β** 10 δὲ: τε **α** 11 ἀλλὰ **α** || χρεών CPz, van H. 13 εἶπαι z, van H. 15 ταὐτὰ van H. 16 προσφέρετε Cobet, van H. || ἀλλὰ γὰρ **β**, Holder, van H. || γίνωνται RV: γίνονται S 17 ὑμῖν RVz 18 ἑτοῖμοι CPz

Plataia, alone excepted, c. 71 *infra*), but in so doing had shown how immensely superior they were to the best Persian troops. The story here is pure Atticism. Not content with having bested the Arkadians, the Athenians must make Sparta too confess her inferiority. There may have been some tactical manœuvre on which this fable was hung (cp. next c.), but as it stands it is a transparent fiction.

The main contrast throughout the speech is between the Athenians (*ὑμέας μὲν . . ὑμεῖς . . ὑμέας μέν*) and the Spartans (*ἡμέας δὲ . . ἡμεῖς δὲ* (*bis*) . . *ἡμέας δέ*).

τοὺς Μήδους καὶ τὴν μάχην αὐτῶν: 'Medes' here equals or covers 'Persians.' *μάχη*, 'style of fighting'; cp. 5. 49.

8. **ἐν Μαραθῶνι**: this homage to Marathon, beside which Thermopylai is not worth mentioning, comes with double effect from a Spartan's lips!

9. **ἀδαής** with *gen. rei*, 2. 49, 5. 90; cp. *ἀδαήμων* 8. 65; the *gen. pers.* is apparently unique. Pausanias uses **ἀνδρῶν**, not *ἀνθρώπων*. The speaker becomes a little involved in his anxiety to make the utter inferiority of the Spartans clear; the second *ἡμεῖς δέ* is virtually the *δέ* with resumed subject, a false antithesis (the real being *Μήδων μὲν ἄπειροι Βοιωτῶν δὲ ἔμπειροι*); but the running antithesis between *ὑμεῖς* and *ἡμεῖς* helps to determine the phraseology.

Σπαρτιητέων . . Μήδων: this statement not only ignores the story of Thermopylai, but implies that any fighting so far in Boiotia has not been done by the Spartans; and moreover that their observation has taught them nothing of the Persian warfare. How, then, has their experience of Boiotians and Thessalians been gained? What fighting had any dead or living Spartan done with Boiotians? The only recorded engagement with Thessalians (5. 63, 64) was rather an unfortunate precedent! Of course, if Pausanias really said all this, it might show how desperately hard up he was for an excuse.

13. **αὐτοῖσι ἡμῖν . . ἐν νόῳ ἐγένετο εἰπεῖν ταῦτα**: i.e. to make the proposal you have just made. (The formula carries further, and may serve to hint that the story stands, almost self-confessed, an Attic fabrication.) **φθάντες προφέρετε**, 'have anticipated us in proposing.'

πάλαι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, rather redundant; and the date only goes back at most ten days.

16. **ἀρρωδέομεν μὴ . . οὐκ ἡδέες γένωνται** is not a true case of the double negative idiom *μὴ οὐ*, the *οὐ* in this case simply coalescing with *ἡδέες* into a single idea = *ἀηδέες* (cp. *οὐ φιλίας* c. 4 *supra*). **δ' ὦν**, much as in c. 45 *supra*. **καὶ . . καί**, the strong co-ordination, cp. c. 26 *supra*. **ἡδομένοισι ἡμῖν**, cp. 8. 101. 10 *supra*.

ἤρεσκε ἀμφοτέροισι ταῦτα, ἠώς τε διέφαινε καὶ διαλλάσσοντο

47. 2 ἡ ὥστε R || διάλασον R : διάλασσον SV

47. 2. ἠώς τε διέφαινε καὶ διαλλάσσοντο τὰς τάξις: the dawn of the twelfth day, according to the Journal, cp. cc. 41, 44 *supra*. The grammatical *parataxis* is observable, cp. 7. 217 ἠώς τε δὴ διέφαινε καὶ οἳ ἐγένοντο ἐπ' ἀκρωτηρίῳ τοῦ ὄρεος. The tenses are important; it does not appear that the exchange of positions was ever fully carried out between the Spartans and Athenians: dawn broke and found them still engaged in the manœuvre. **τὸ ποιεύμενον**, too, is imperfect. (Blakesley's trans. is misleading: "with the very break of day they changed their respective positions.") Hdt. indeed does not expressly say that the manœuvre was not carried out; he leaves, however, the impression that it was not fully carried out, but was arrested, by the rapid counter-development on the Persian side, which showed Pausanias that his purpose had been discovered.

This chapter perhaps conceals a great mystery. Presumably there was an excuse in fact for the story of the exchange of positions. Some manœuvre, some development in the position of the Greeks took place, which lent colour to the Athenian version of the affair. Speeches and motivation with Hdt. are in a different category to acts and events: the reported order, the chronological succession of acts and events, is often less acceptable than the bare acts or events themselves; they, in turn, seldom present a complete series, and frequently undergo a transfiguration, for better or for worse; but Hdt. is nevertheless not a mere novelist, not even a mere historical novelist. All this justifies considerable freedom in the hypothetical reconstruction of a story, which in its traditional form is inadequate and incredible; and it makes reconstruction inevitable. The exchange of positions, according to Hdt., is to take place on the twelfth day of the occupation by the Greeks of the position 'on the Asopos' marked by the Androkrateion and Gargaphia. Is it credible that for eleven days the Greeks occupied this position unmolested? Why then suddenly on the twelfth day is the cavalry loosed upon them, and the position immediately rendered untenable? Again, why is so much stress laid on the fact that it was a man on horseback that came to the Athenian lines on the night of the eleventh, if the Greek and Persian armies were then in close contact, only separated by the Asopos? If the Makedonian came on a horse, it was because he had a good deal of ground to cover; in other words, the Greeks were not ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ on the eleventh, or any of the preceding days. Hdt. has apparently antedated the occupation by the Greeks of the position 'on the Asopos,' that is, round the Androkrateion, with Gargaphia in their rear; and has underestimated and misconceived the 'first position' and its developments, in front of Hysiai and Plataiai. It was only on the twelfth that the Greeks descended to the 'second' position, i.e. the hills in front of Gargaphia 'on the Asopos'—probably counting on the Persians crossing the river to attack them. In the process of advancing a tactical manœuvre, or series of manœuvres, is performed, which is misunderstood, parodied, and converted *ad maiorem gloriam Atheniensium* in this passage at the expense of the Spartans; exactly as in a previous passage the move from the position at Erythrai to the position at Hysiai had been similarly exploited, at the expense of the Tegeatai. The exact nature of the manœuvre may be a matter of dispute. Hdt. treats the μετάταξις, or μετακόσμησις, as purely a question between the two wings, the centre taking no part in it. In reality the whole line was doubtless involved. There was an advance *en échelon*, which Atticizing tradition interpreted as an attempt on the part of the Lakedaimonians to get into the Athenian position. There was perhaps more than that, an actual development, whereby the Lakedaimonians came to stand where the Athenians had been standing, on the extreme left of the line; and again the Athenians finally, when Gargaphia was passed, were again standing on the extreme left of the line. This was the manœuvre by which the position ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ was actually occupied. Whether it had the appearance of an attempt to outflank the Persians, or not, may be questioned; such can hardly have been its real purpose. With their hopeless inferiority in mounted men the Greeks

τὰς τάξις. γνόντες δὲ οἱ Βοιωτοὶ τὸ ποιεύμενον ἐξαγορεύουσι Μαρδονίῳ. ὁ δ᾽ ἐπείτε ἤκουσε, αὐτίκα μετιστάναι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπειρᾶτο παράγων τοὺς Πέρσας κατὰ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους. ὡς δὲ ἔμαθε τοῦτο τοιοῦτο γινόμενον ὁ Παυσανίης, γνοὺς ὅτι οὐ λανθάνει, ὀπίσω ἦγε τοὺς Σπαρτιήτας ἐπὶ τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας· ὡς δὲ αὔτως καὶ ὁ Μαρδόνιος ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐωνύμου.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ κατέστησαν ἐς τὰς ἀρχαίας τάξις, πέμψας ὁ Μαρδόνιος κήρυκα ἐς τοὺς Σπαρτιήτας ἔλεγε τάδε. "ὦ **48** *Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ὑμεῖς δὴ λέγεσθε εἶναι ἄνδρες ἄριστοι ὑπὸ τῶν*

---

3 *τάξεις* CRV ‖ *δ᾽* RV 4 *δὲ* RV 6 *τοιοῦτον* **B** ‖ *γενόμενον* Pz 7, 8 utrum *τοὺς Σπαρτιήτας* genuina sint an post *Μαρδόνιος* exciderint *τοὺς Πέρσας* dubit. van H. 8 *ὥς* Stein : *ὧς* van H. : *ὡς* ‖ *δ᾽* CPz ‖ *αὔτως καὶ* : *καὶ αὐτὸς* **B** ‖ <*τοὺς Πέρσας*> *ἐπὶ* (van H.), Holder ‖ *τὸ εὐώνυμον* **B**, Holder, van H. **48.** 1 *τάξεις* CR ‖ *ὁ* om. **B** 2 *κήρυκας* C 3 *λέγεσθαι* R

---

would have been courting certain destruction in moving, or attempting to move, on Thebes, by the Plataia-Thebes road. Mardonios draws out his line of battle on the north bank of the Asopos; he deploys to the west. The medizing Greeks, occupying the extreme west of the Laager, may have been potentially opposite the Greek right for a while, until they pushed up the river westwards, their places being taken by the Medes and Persians. Mardonios has now drawn the Greeks down to the Asopos; he hopes to draw or drive them across. He gives them no peace all this day: the cavalry ride round the position freely, harass them extremely, and destroy and cut off the water-supply. For but one single day do the Greeks maintain themselves in this position; they have been disappointed of their expectation that Mardonios would send his infantry across the Asopos to do battle, and they determine to retreat (or to return?) to the position on 'the island' (c. 51 *infra*), or the position of which the island was the most prominent feature.

8. **ὡς δὲ αὔτως καὶ ὁ Μαρδόνιος**: sc. *ἦγε τοὺς Πέρσας*.

48. 1. **τὰς ἀρχαίας τάξις**: i.e. the order, or positions, 'originally occupied' before the changes, or attempted changes, recorded in c. 47.

2. **κήρυκα . . ἔλεγε τάδε**: the exact words of Mardonios' message! The speaker must have been a Greek, or a 'diglott.' The herald apparently comes across the river (with a flag of truce?) to the Spartan quarters; but the story was never so told in Sparta! The speech is an Athenian Appendix to the previous Athenian self-glorifications. It contains some sarcastic reflexions on Spartan reputation, and an extremely sporting offer, or challenge, on Mardonios' part. Grote discredits the anecdote; Rawlinson defends the 'Homeric' (*sic!*) taunt as quite agreeable to the practice of primitive and specially oriental races (rather contradictory terms), but even he admits that the challenge is less probable. Here again we may fairly conjecture that there was some foundation in fact for the fiction. The object of Mardonios must still have been to induce the Greeks to cross the river. Did he really offer them a free and unmolested passage? Or did he offer to come across if they would give him time to reform on their side? Such offers are not made in war *à outrance*; but the Persians were cavaliers and sportsmen, and Mardonios may have thought of the Greeks as his own future subjects. (Cp. the Assyrian challenge to Hezekiah, 2 *Kings* 18. 23.)

3. **δή** is sarcastic; cp. 1. 115. The first of four such in the speech, to which add **ἄρα, νῦν ὦν, δ᾽ ὦν, καί, δέ, ἀλλά,** all of which heighten the effect, to say nothing of the blunter satire in the more material phrases and propositions.

τῇδε ἀνθρώπων, ἐκπαγλεομένων ὡς οὔτε φεύγετε ἐκ πολέμου οὔτε τάξιν ἐκλείπετε, μένοντές τε ἢ ἀπόλλυτε τοὺς ἐναντίους ἢ αὐτοὶ ἀπόλλυσθε. τῶν δ' ἄρ' ἦν οὐδὲν ἀληθές· πρὶν γὰρ ἢ συμμεῖξαι ἡμέας ἐς χειρῶν τε νόμον ἀπικέσθαι, καὶ δὴ φεύγοντας καὶ στάσιν ἐκλείποντας ὑμέας εἴδομεν, ἐν Ἀθηναίοισί τε τὴν πρόπειραν ποιευμένους αὐτούς τε ἀντία δούλων τῶν ἡμετέρων τασσομένους. ταῦτα οὐδαμῶς ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργα, ἀλλὰ πλεῖστον δὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐψεύσθημεν. προσδεκόμενοι γὰρ κατὰ κλέος ὡς δὴ πέμψετε ἐς ἡμέας κήρυκα προκαλεύμενοι καὶ βουλόμενοι μούνοισι Πέρσῃσι μάχεσθαι, ἄρτιοι ἐόντες ποιέειν ταῦτα οὐδὲν τοιοῦτο λέγοντας ὑμέας εὕρομεν ἀλλὰ πτώσσοντας μᾶλλον. νῦν ὦν ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ὑμεῖς ἤρξατε τούτου

---

4 *ἐκπλαγεομένων* **B** 6 *δὲ* **a** 7 *συμμῖξαι* libri, Stein[1 2], Holder || *ὑμέας* **B** 8 *στάσιν* : *τάξιν* **B**, Holder || *ἐκλιπόντας* RV 9 *πεῖραν* **B** || *ἀντὶ* **B** 10 *ταῦτα δὲ* z 11 *προσδοκώμενοι* C 13 *μοῦνοι* z : *μοῦνοι μούνοισι* Koen, Holder, van H. 14 *τοιοῦτον* **B** || *ὑμέας* om. **B** 15 *πτώσοντας* SMarc.

The contrast in **ἄνδρες : ἀνθρώπων** is intentional. **τῇδε**, 'in these parts.'

4. **ἐκπαγλεομένων**: cp. 7. 181. Mardonios was no doubt with Xerxes at Thermopylai, cp. 7. 209, and had heard Demaratos' testimonials to his countrymen! The reputation of the Spartans *ὡς ἀπολεόμενοί τε καὶ ἀπολέοντες* (*l.c.*) was unshaken in Greece down to 425 B.C.; cp. Thuc. 4. 40. 1. (The notion that this speech dates after that disillusionment will not do; the point, the irony of the passage, lies in its barbarous insolence.)

6. **τῶν δ' ἄρ' ἦν οὐδὲν ἀληθές.** Mardonios, like the Athenians throughout, ignores the lesson of Thermopylai. But that story had not yet reached the classic development which it exhibits in Bk. 7 *supra*, a form which illustrates the effects of dialectic on the genesis of tradition, partly in answer to the charge of blundering, and partly, no doubt, in answer to other Athenian criticisms. **ἄρα** gives a touch of ironic surprise, and the irony is also continued in the tense.

7. **συμμεῖξαι**: of hostile congress, cp. 8. 94, so that **ἐς χειρῶν τε νόμον ἀπικέσθαι** (cp. 8. 89) is somewhat tautologous.

ἡμέας: us and you?

καὶ δή=*ἤδη*: cp. 8. 94. 11 *supra*.

8. **στάσιν**=*τάξιν*: cp. c. 21 *supra*.

ἐν Ἀθηναίοισί τε τὴν πρόπειραν ποιευμένους: the phrase betrays the source. For *πρ. ποιεῖσθαι* cp. Thuc. 3. 86. 4 *πρόπειράν τε ποιούμενοι εἰ σφίσι δυνατὰ εἴη τὰ ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ πράγματα ὑποχείρια γενέσθαι.* Here the Athenians would remember that they had already furnished a *πρόπειρα* at Erythrai, c. 21 *supra*, to say nothing of Marathon c. 46 *supra*. Athenian tradition fully exploited this *motif*; cp. Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 16.

9. **ἀντία δούλων τῶν ἡμετέρων**: pleasant hearing, or reading, for Thebans, and other medizers! *ἀντία*, plural; cp. c. 31 *supra*.

11. **ἐν ὑμῖν**, 'in your case.'

12. **κατὰ κλέος**, *ob vestram gloriam*, Baehr; cp. c. 38 *supra*.

προκαλέεσθαι, 'to challenge' (Homeric, but also legal Attic).

13. **ἄρτιοι**: cp. c. 27 *supra*.

14. **εὕρομεν**: cp. c. 28 *supra*. The tense is observable; we might render it in the perfect, 'we have found'; so too **ἤρξατε** just below.

15. **πτώσσοντας**: like timid birds; an Homeric word and metaphor *passim*, e.g. *Il.* 7. 129. Oddly enough Tyrtaios (a Spartan!) uses it without any suggestion of fear: 11. 36 (Bergk ii.[4] 17) *ὑμεῖς δ' ὦ γυμνῆτες, ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος πτώσσοντες μεγάλοις βάλλετε χερμαδίοις.*

νῦν ὦν: here too the speaker comes to the point; cp. c. 45 *supra*.

ἐπειδὴ . . ἀλλά: cp. c. 42 *supra* *ἐπεὶ . . ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐρέω.*

τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἄρχομεν. τί δὴ οὐ πρὸ μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑμεῖς, ἐπείτε δεδόξωσθε εἶναι ἄριστοι, πρὸ δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων ἡμεῖς, ἴσοι πρὸς ἴσους ἀριθμὸν ἐμαχεσάμεθα; καὶ ἢν μὲν δοκέῃ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μάχεσθαι, οἳ δ' ὦν μετέπειτα μαχέσθων ὕστεροι· εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ δοκέοι ἀλλ' ἡμέας μούνους ἀποχρᾶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ διαμαχεσώμεθα· ὁκότεροι δ' ἂν ἡμέων νικήσωσι, τούτους τῷ ἅπαντι στρατοπέδῳ νικᾶν." ὃ μὲν **49**
ταῦτα εἴπας τε καὶ ἐπισχὼν χρόνον, ὥς οἱ οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ὑπεκρίνατο, ἀπαλλάσσετο ὀπίσω, ἀπελθὼν δὲ ἐσήμαινε Μαρδονίῳ τὰ καταλαβόντα. ὃ δὲ περιχαρὴς γενόμενος καὶ ἐπαερθεὶς ψυχρῇ νίκῃ ἐπῆκε τὴν ἵππον ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας.

---

16 *ἄρξομεν* **B** || *τί δὴ οὐ ὦν* R: *τί δὴ ὦν* V: *τὸ δὴ ὦν* S 17 *ἐπεὶ* vel *ἐπείπερ* malit van H. 18 *μαχεσόμεθα* S, Wesseling, Gaisford 19 *δοκῆι* **a**C: *δοκεῖς* Marc. 20 *ὕστερον* **B** 21 *διαμαχεσόμεθα* **B**z
49. 2 *οἱ* om. C 3 *ὑπεκρίνετο* **B**, Holder, van H. || *ἐσήμηνε* **B** 5 *ἐπαρθεὶς* libri

---

16. **τί δὴ οὐ . . ἐμαχεσάμεθα;** this 'Attic' form of challenge, 'mostly with the aorist,' is only found in this one place in Hdt. (Stein). Cp. Madvig, § 111, R. c; 141, R. 3.

17. **δεδόξωσθε**: cp. 7. 135, 8. 124; the perfect is both more magniloquent and also slightly suggestive of a *temps passé*. It is time they did something *κατὰ κλέος δή*.

πρὸ δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων ἡμεῖς. Hdt. gives himself, his source, his herald, and Mardonios away in this phrase; it is a sheer impossibility. When Plautus uses *barbarus* for Roman it is by the mouth of a *dramatis persona* who would use the word naturally, as even in his prologues: 'Demophilus scripsit, Marcus vortit barbare!' *Trinum.* 19, *Asin.* 10. If this grated on a Roman ear, it was after all a comedy. Here the noble Persian commander by the mouth of his herald taunting the premier Greeks writes himself down—just at a Greek's valuation! That the messenger in the *Persai* of Aischylos does the like (187, 225, 337) emphasizes the unhistorical character of this speech put by Hdt. into the mouth of Mardonios.

18. **ἴσοι πρὸς ἴσους.** Xerxes had among his guards men prepared to engage three Greeks at a time, 7. 103; in his own playful vein he had suggested to Demaratos that as a Spartan king he should be prepared to tackle a score of Persians. Mardonios proposes the strictest λόγον *μουνομαχίης*. Such proposals in the eyes of the Spartans of the fifth century might be magnificent but were not war; cp. Thuc. 5. 41. 3.

19. **ἢν μὲν δοκέῃ . . εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ δοκέοι**: the first gives the more probable, the second the less probable alternative.

οἳ δ' ὦν seems to combine (1) *δέ* with resumed subject, (2) *δέ in apodosi*, (3) *δ' ὦν* as a significant admission. **ἡμεῖς δέ** combines (1) and (2).

21. **ἀποχρᾶν**: cp. c. 94 *infra*. **νικᾶν**, 'be victors'; cp. cc. 69, 100 *infra*.

49. 2. **ἐπισχὼν χρόνον**, 'after pausing a while'; cp. 5. 16, 1. 175, and c. 93 *infra*.

οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ὑπεκρίνατο. The Athenian or phil-Attic concocters of the story did not venture to devise a reply for the Spartans, who could only have referred Mardonios to Thermopylai for proof of their mettle; that was their *πρόπειρα*. This haughty silence (for the story now begins in the hands of Hdt. to round somewhat to the Spartan side) recalls the indifference of the Spartans at Thermopylai to the curious Persian scout, 7. 208.

4. **τὰ καταλαβόντα**: sc. *ἑαυτόν*: cp. cc. 93, 104 *infra*.

ὃ δὲ περιχαρὴς κτλ.: "an Hellenic view of Mardonios' sentiments, with no foundation of truth," Blakesley. *περιχ.* 3. 35.

5. **ἐπαερθεὶς ψυχρῇ νίκῃ**: for the participle cp. 5. 81, 6. 132, 7. 38. **ψ. ν.**, *inani victoria*, cp. 6. 108.

ἐπῆκε τὴν ἵππον ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας.

ὡς δὲ ἐπήλασαν οἱ ἱππόται, ἐσίνοντο πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὴν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἐσακοντίζοντές τε καὶ τοξεύοντες ὥστε ἱπποτοξόται τε ἐόντες καὶ προσφέρεσθαι ἄποροι· τήν τε κρήνην τὴν Γαργαφίην, ἀπ' ἧς ὑδρεύετο πᾶν τὸ στράτευμα τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, συνετάραξάν <τε> καὶ συνέχωσαν. ἦσαν μὲν

6 ἐσινέοντο **B** 7 ἐστοξεύοντες **B**, Holder, van H. || ὥσγε Marc.: ὥστε καὶ **B** || ἱπποτόξαι V 8 τε om. **B**C || εὔποροι *z* 9 γαρσαφίην S 10 <τε> (van H.), Stein[3] || ἔσαν *z*

If little or nothing has been heard of the Persian cavalry for twelve days, it must be because the Greeks were in a position where the cavalry could not get at them, or else because the services of the cavalry have been suppressed. The cavalry, however, had at least cut the Greek lines of communication by Dryoskephalai, c. 39 *supra*. If they had not also already destroyed Gargaphia, and rendered the Greek position at Gargaphia untenable, it must be because that position had not been occupied by the Greeks until this very day, to wit, the twelfth. On this day the Greeks were reduced to the necessity of advancing across the Asopos, or else retiring and giving up the position.

6. **ἐσίνοντο πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιήν**: the Persian cavalry, and perhaps the Boiotian, Thessalian, Makedonian, could now ride completely round the Greek position, and especially could harass the Greeks in the rear. The horsemen evidently did not attempt to ascend the hill-slopes and sides, but swept safely through the trough in the hills, in which Gargaphia and its neighbouring wells lay, and lie. A detachment of Lakedaimonians may have been posted near the wells, in the vain attempt to save them: these men must have been beaten back northwards on to the 'Asopos Ridge.' What were the hosts of *ψιλοί* about on the Greek side? They should, were they in being, have kept the Persian cavalry off. It is this situation which makes it difficult to believe in the 69,500 Greek *ψιλοί* of c. 30 *supra*, or even a tithe of that number.

7. **ὥστε ἱπποτοξόται τε ἐόντες καὶ προσφέρεσθαι ἄποροι**: *ὥστε* = *ἅτε*, cp. c. 37 *supra*. With *προσφ. ἀπ.* cp. *ἄποροι προσμίσγειν* 4. 46. The meaning is evidently that it was difficult to come to close quarters with them. Blakesley renders "impossible to bring to close fight"—as though *προσφέρεσθαι* were passive, or, if not, as if *αὐτούς* were to be understood. The verb is better taken as middle, or deponent, *ἐς αὐτοὺς* or *αὐτοῖς* being understood, the construction being the personal instead of the neuter: *ἄπορον ἦν προσφέρεσθαι ἐς αὐτούς* (*αὐτοῖς*), 'it was impossible to come to close quarters with them.'

The difficulty affects hoplites, not *ψιλοί, τοξόται, ἀκοντισταί, σφενδονῆται, κτλ.*, who should have shot down the horses and men, *eminus*, at least if they had been decently trained; but they were probably *πτώσσοντες* among the hoplites! On the superiority of the Persian still at the end of the fifth century cp. Xenoph. *Anab.* 3. 3. 7.

ἱπποτοξόται: a form of service afterwards familiar in Athens (cp. Thuc. 2. 13. 8), though a corps of 200 could not hope to effect very much. The Persian cavalry, Hdt. says (7. 84), had the same equipment as the infantry (described in 7. 61) including bows and arrows, and short spears, i.e. throwing spears, javelins. Rawlinson argues from Arrian 1. 15 (the Granikos) and 3. 15 (Arbela) that in Alexander's day the favourite weapon of the Persian cavalry was the javelin (*jereed*). Cp. c. 17 *supra*.

8. **τήν τε κρήνην τὴν Γαργαφίην**: cp. c. 25 *supra* for its identity and position. The statement here that the whole Greek force under arms (*στράτευμα*, not *στρατόπεδον*) depended on this one source for water-supply might have warned Hdt. that the position could hardly have been occupied for twelve days! What? 110,000 men, for twelve days, watered from one spring? It would needs have been a copious one. Now at any rate in the course of a few hours the Persian cavalry renders it quite useless—as they could have done on any one of the preceding eleven days!

10. **συνετάραξαν καὶ συνέχωσαν**: the first verb describes the condition of the water-supply after the Persian cavalry

ὦν κατὰ τὴν κρήνην Λακεδαιμόνιοι τεταγμένοι μοῦνοι, τοῖσι δὲ ἄλλοισι Ἕλλησι ἡ μὲν κρήνη πρόσω ἐγίνετο, ὡς ἕκαστοι ἔτυχον τεταγμένοι, ὁ δὲ Ἀσωπὸς ἀγχοῦ· ἐρυκόμενοι δὲ τοῦ

11 μοῦνοι τεταγμένοι z || τοῖσι . . τεταγμένοι om. B 12 ἄλλησι Marc. || ἐγένετο z 13 ἀπὸ τοῦ CPz

has been riding over it and through it; the second the absolute dilapidation of the troughs, basin, stone-work, and so forth (cp. c. 13 *supra*) which they must have dismounted to effect. Pausan. 9. 4. 2 has little independent value, but may be just worth quoting: τὴν δὲ κρήνην τὴν Γαργαφίαν Μαρδόνιος καὶ ἡ ἵππος συνέχεεν ἡ Περσῶν, ὅτι τὸ Ἑλλήνων στράτευμα τὸ ἀντικαθήμενόν σφισιν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἔπινεν· ὕστερον μέντοι τὸ ὕδωρ ἀνεσώσαντο οἱ Πλαταιεῖς.

ἦσαν μὲν ὦν . . Λακεδαιμόνιοι: ὦν marks the gravity of the situation. That Lakedaimonians and Lakedaimonians alone (**μοῦνοι**) were posted opposite, or 'over against' the fountain, suggests several inferences. (1) The main body of the Lakedaimonians form the Greek right wing, stationed apparently on the high ground immediately north of the spring, or well (Grundy's 'Gargaphia'); but (2) doubtless a detachment would have been on guard in the immediate vicinity of the water. If so, that detachment cannot have maintained its ground.

If *Apotripi* be Gargaphia, the Greek left would have to be moved a little, but only a little, westward. In reality the centre probably watered from *Apotripi*, which no doubt was equally destroyed by the Persian cavalry. The centre was posted immediately in and about the Androkrateion (the Church of St. John).

The left wing may have been expected to get its water from the stream A^1 running down from *Apotripi* into the Asopos proper, or failing that from *Apotripi*.

11. **τοῖσι δὲ ἄλλοισι Ἕλλησι:** i.e. the right centre (οἱ ἀμφὶ Κορινθίους c. 69), the left centre (οἱ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας τε καὶ Φλειασίους *ib.*) and the left wing (Athenians and Plataians). The Tegeatai are probably lumped with the Lakedaimonians above.

12. **ἡ μὲν κρήνη πρόσω ἐγίνετο:** πρόσω is the antithesis of ἐγγύς, cp. Plato, *Protag.* 356. There is no need to expand ἡ κρήνη into ἡ εἰς τὴν κρήνην ὁδός (Sitzler), but the next words, ὡς ἕκαστοι ἔτυχον τεταγμένοι, introduce an element of relativity or comparison into πρόσω, to which the imperfect ἐγίνετο is also adapted: the well was not equi-distant from all; it was not near to any, but it was further from some (the Athenians) than from others (the centre), according to their places in the line of battle.

13. **ὁ δὲ Ἀσωπὸς ἀγχοῦ:** ἀγχοῦ = ἄγχι = ἐγγύς. Used with a dat. 3. 85 ἀγχοῦ τῇ ἵππῳ. The assertion that the Asopos was near any of the Greeks, or any of the Greeks near the Asopos, is puzzling. The whole position, indeed, has been described above, c. 30, as ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ, but that is relatively to the previous position ἐπὶ τῇ ὑπωρέῃ, and not from the point of view of the actual water-supply. The Greek position along the tops of the Asopos Ridge was not, from the army-service point of view, near the Asopos, if by Asopos is meant the main stream (as in c. 30, and *passim*). Hdt. has here probably made a mistake, owing to his ignorance of the ground: that the parts of the army which were not near Gargaphia were near the Asopos may be a blind inference from the general (and not, broadly speaking, incorrect) description of their position as ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ. It is possible, however, that Dr. G. B. Grundy's suggestion (for a phrase in c. 31 *supra*, *q.v.*) is here applicable, and that 'Asopos' is here used of stream A^1, though not with conscious knowledge or discrimination on the historian's part. The Greek left, in particular the Athenians, were certainly in the vicinity of this streamlet, but were no doubt unable to use it ὑπό τε τῶν ἱππέων καὶ τοξευμάτων. They may erroneously have spoken of it as the Asopos, or the Plataian Asopos; but Hdt., had he known the real state of the case, would surely have distinguished expressly between the main stream and this comparatively insignificant affluent.

ἐρυκόμενοι: passive; cp. 5. 15.

Ἀσωποῦ οὕτω δὴ ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην ἐφοίτων· ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ γάρ σφι οὐκ ἐξῆν ὕδωρ φορέεσθαι ὑπό τε τῶν ἱππέων καὶ
50 τοξευμάτων. τούτου δὲ τοιούτου γινομένου οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στρατηγοί, ἅτε τοῦ τε ὕδατος στερηθείσης τῆς στρατιῆς καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἵππου ταρασσομένης, συνελέχθησαν περὶ αὐτῶν τε τούτων καὶ ἄλλων, ἐλθόντες παρὰ Παυσανίην ἐπὶ τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας. ἄλλα γὰρ τούτων τοιούτων ἐόντων μᾶλλον σφέας ἐλύπεε· οὔτε γὰρ σιτία εἶχον ἔτι, οἵ τε σφέων ὀπέωνες

14 ἐφοιτέων C: ἐφοίτεον Pz, Stein[1], van H. 15 ὕδωρ om. S
50. 1 γενομένου Marc. 3 αὐτέων τε τουτέων z 4 Παυσανίην ἐπὶ om. z 5 ἄλλα A[2]SMarc.: ἀλλὰ || τουτέων z || μᾶλλον σφέας AB, Stein[2]: μᾶλλόν σφεας 6 ἐπελύπεε CP || τέ σφεων vulgo || ὀπεῶνες R: ὀπαῶνες S: ὀπάονες Schaefer

14. **οὕτω δή**: here not temporal but modal, or even causal.

15. **ὑπό**: cp. c. 45. 17 *supra.*

50. 1. **τούτου δὲ τοιούτου γινομένου**, 'such coming to be the state of the case,' 'things getting to this pass' (cp. 5. 109)—a somewhat vague phrase, repeated below in more positive or substantial form, *τούτων τοιούτων ἐόντων*, but explained as referring to the two serious incommodities, (1) the ruin of the water-supply, (2) the harassing fire from the cavalry. Nor was this all! (3) The army was without rations, and (4) completely cut off from its base: (3) and (4) were vexing them all the more (*μᾶλλον σφέας ἐλύπεε*) owing to the sudden development of (1) and (2)! The admissions made in this chapter are notable; but the logical and chronological sequences are not acceptable.

οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στρατηγοί: other than Pausanias (and Euryanax), who no doubt summoned them to the Council of War, which is held on the right wing. The position of the Greek force is highly precarious. The question before the Council must have been whether to advance and cross the Asopos, or to retreat. The third alternative, remaining where they are, is impossible.

6. **οὔτε γὰρ σιτία εἶχον ἔτι.** This had been probably one of the chief reasons for their advance to the position on the Asopos Ridge, in which they were offering battle to the Persian, if only he would come across the Asopos with his infantry. Mardonios had perhaps turned them out of their position at Hysiai by seizing and occupying Dryoskephalai, and forced them to come down to the Asopos and offer battle; he is still, no doubt, even hoping to draw or drive them across the Asopos. Hdt., who keeps the Greeks twelve days on the Asopos Ridge, for eleven of which they are absolutely unmolested and allowed to water freely from Gargaphia, now at last admits that battle or retreat is a necessity, owing to the complete breakdown of the commissariat; that breakdown being due to the complete command attained by the Persian cavalry of the main route to the rear of the Greek forces. The difficult Plataia-Megara pass remains indeed open; and it is just upon that they resolve to fall back, for even that pass was no use to them in their present position.

οἵ τε σφέων ὀπέωνες ἀποπεμφθέντες ἐς Πελοπόννησον: the *ὀπέωνες* = the *ψιλοὶ τῶν εἱλωτέων, περὶ ἄνδρα ἕκαστον ἑπτὰ τεταγμένοι* (c. 28 *supra*) and the *ψιλοί, ὡς εἷς περὶ ἕκαστον ἐὼν ἄνδρα* (c. 30 *supra*), whatever their total numbers. The Peloponnesian portion of them has been sent away, to bring up supplies (**ὡς ἐπισιτιεύμενοι**, cp. 7. 176), to manage the *ἐπισίτησις* of their masters, and cannot get back, the Greek army being completely isolated in its present position by the Persian cavalry.

This passage goes to show that the only *ὀπέωνες*, or *ψιλοί*, in camp, or with the army, at this crisis, would be those in attendance on the Athenians, Megarians, Plataians. The presumption is, however, that the Athenian and Megarian *ὀπέωνες* were also absent (though the Athenian *τοξόται* were of course on the spot, cp. c. 60 *infra*). The army was practically a purely hoplite force at this moment.

ἀποπεμφθέντες ἐς Πελοπόννησον ὡς ἐπισιτιευμενοι ἀπεκεκληίατο ὑπὸ τῆς ἵππου, οὐ δυνάμενοι ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τὸ στρατοπεδον.
βουλευομένοισι δὲ τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι ἔδοξε, ἢν ὑπερβάλωνται 51
ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέρην οἱ Πέρσαι συμβολὴν ποιεύμενοι, ἐς τὴν

---

7 *ἀπεκεκληίατο* Dindorf, Stein, Holder : *ἀποκεκληίατο* van H. : *ἀποκεκλέατο* **B**z : *ἀπεκεκλέατο* 8 *ὑπὸ* : *ἀπὸ* C || *ἀπικέεσθαι* R **51.** 2 *κείνην* z || *μὴ ποιεύμενοι* **B**, Holder, van H.

But, perhaps, we should allow still the regulation attendant on each hoplite.

7. **ἀπεκεκληίατο**, 'were utterly and had for some time previously been shut off,' from returning. *Ionice pro ἀποκεκλεισμένοι ἦσαν*, Schweighaeuser (but cp. Veitch, *Gk. Verbs* s.v. *κλείω*). Cp. *ἀποκλησθέντες τῆς ὀπίσω ὁδοῦ* 3. 55, in a somewhat different connexion.

8. **ὑπό**: cp. c. 37 *supra*. The Persian cavalry completely dominates the situation. On the night of the 8th (c. 39 *supra*) they have seized *Dryoskephalai*, the junction of the Eleutherai-Erythrai and Eleutherai-Hysiai-Plataia roads, in the rear of the Greek position, at Hysiai. The Persians have, of course, maintained their hold on that position. In consequence the Greeks are cut off from their base (except by the difficult Plataia-Megara route), and on the 11th (no doubt) come to the determination to go down to a position *ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ*, and offer battle to the Persian. This manœuvre is carried out upon the 12th (perhaps not without some loss) and Mardonios moves into position opposite them, with the Asopos still between, c. 47 *supra*.

Still, neither side will cross the river; but all that day, the 12th, the Greeks are harassed by the cavalry, cut off from the water-supply on all sides, cut off from their bases, not merely *via* Erythrai and Hysiai, but even *via* Plataia; the rations they have with them are giving out—battle or retreat becomes an absolute necessity.

51. 1. **βουλευομένοισι δὲ τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι ἔδοξε**: a council of war never fights; but this time the council was right. The two alternatives for the Persians are here presented by tradition—(*a*) that the Persians should come across the river and attack them (**διαβῆναι τὸν Ἀσωπὸν καὶ μάχης ἄρξαι**); (*b*) that the Persians should not do so, but postpone for that day, or indefinitely, delivering the attack (**ἢν ὑπερβάλωνται . . οἱ Πέρσαι συμβολὴν ποιεύμενοι**). Here *συμβολὴν ποιέεσθαι* has nothing to say to the cavalry skirmishing which was going on, but of course means to bring on a general engagement, to deliver the attack, *μάχης ἄρξαι*. The participial construction is noticeable. Only one course is treated as open to the Greeks, viz. to retreat. But there was another, viz. to advance, to cross the Asopos, to assume the offensive. That was what Alexander did at the Granikos; but then, Alexander's army was not composed simply of hoplites. To have crossed the Asopos must have meant annihilation to the army of Pausanias. He had no cavalry. He had practically no *ψιλοί*, or none worth counting. Crossing the stream would have broken the Greek ranks. Once across the Persian cavalry could have ridden round and round them on the comparatively level and open plain. On a smaller scale the situation would have anticipated Arbela, with no cavalry, no light infantry, no developed tactics, no Alexander, on the Greek side; the issue would have been the annihilation of the Greek army, the hot victory of Mardonios. The Asopos stream was a Rubicon indeed; the Greek determination to remain south of it was their salvation; Mardonios crossed it to his ruin. Had he crossed on the 12th the result would have been the same. The Council of War was only summoned by Pausanias (and Euryanax) when it became fairly obvious that the Persian infantry was not coming across, and that the present position was untenable.

2. **ἐς τὴν νῆσον ἰέναι**: this was to retreat (perhaps to the position previously occupied). A third alternative besides advancing and retreating was logically possible, viz. to stay where they were, and as they were, in hopes the Persian might still deliver an attack. But why should he grant to-morrow what he refuses to-day? Or how are they to remain, without water, without rations?

Where is the island to be located? And how? The measurements given

νῆσον ἰέναι. ἡ δὲ ἐστὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀσωποῦ καὶ τῆς κρήνης τῆς Γαργαφίης, ἐπ' ᾗ ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο τότε, δέκα σταδίους ἀπέχουσα, πρὸ τῆς Πλαταιέων πόλιος. νῆσος δὲ οὕτω ἂν εἴη ἐν ἠπείρῳ· σχιζόμενος [ὁ] ποταμὸς ἄνωθεν ἐκ τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος

3 δ' ἔστιν R 4 γαρσαφίης S || ἐπ' ᾗ **B** : ἐς τὴν z : ἐπ' ἣν 5 ἔχουσα **B** || νῆσος . . ἐς τὠυτό del. Krueger || δ' ἂν **B** 6 ὁ secl. Stein[2], Holder, van H.

by Hdt. are not the most important evidence in determining the site. His measurements are only round numbers, approximative, in decimals. The important factors are:—(i.) The island was *πρὸ τῆς Πλαταιέων πόλιος*. (ii.) The island was formed not by the Asopos, or its tributaries, but by the Oëroë. These two factors were, indeed, used by Leake and Vischer in fixing the island away to the west, beyond the main road from Plataia to Thebes. (iii.) The strategic and tactical necessities of the case must be met. From this point of view the objections to Leake's location are overpowering. On such an island the Greeks (*a*) would still have been exposed to the attacks of the Persian cavalry, (*b*) would not have been in a better position as regards supplies. The island must be sought up on the *ὑπωρέη*, and it must be backed by the only remaining pass through which the Greeks could draw supplies, viz. the difficult Plataia-Megara route; and there must be a water-supply. The position proposed by Dr. Grundy meets these requirements: (i.) it is in front of Plataia (and perhaps also Hysiai?); (ii.) it is formed by the Oëroë; (iii.) it is inaccessible to cavalry, backed by the route to Megara, and well supplied with water (Oëroë, *Vergutiani* spring); and also (iv.) accords rather better with the measurements given by Hdt., such as they are, than the position assigned by Leake and Vischer. Cp. G. B. Grundy, *G. P. W.* pp. 480 ff.

3. **ἡ δὲ ἐστὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀσωποῦ κτλ.**: how vague are the distances as expressed by Hdt. in stades is shown by his pairing the Asopos and Gargaphia together as 'ten stades' from the 'island.' Unless Gargaphia and the Asopos are identical they can hardly have been so exactly the same distance from a third point. Again, if by 'the Asopos' were here meant the main stream, we should either have to fall back on Leake's location of the island, or to confess that Hdt.'s measurement is valueless. If the Asopos here = A^1, it approximates sufficiently to Gargaphia to allow Hdt.'s measure to pass, and to refer to Dr. Grundy's 'island,' as above.

κρήνη is a fountain, with artificial pipes, outlet, and so forth, as distinct from *φρέαρ*, a well, 1. 68 (cp. 4. 120) and *πηγή*, a spring, source, 1. 189, 7. 26.

4. **ἐπ' ᾗ ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο τότε**: the apparent exclusion of the Asopos from the purview of the Hellenic Laager is curious; but (*a*) the singular of the relative may have been determined by the proximity of the feminine antecedent; (*b*) the council was being held on the right wing of the Greek position, and the right wing was in immediate proximity to the fountain; (*c*) the Asopos just above has been defined as more or less near the position of the Greek contingents, and so perhaps comes to be omitted here (as in c. 25); (*d*) the grammatical construction might be strained, so as to carry back and cover the Asopos too, *κατὰ σύνεσιν*.

5. **πρὸ τῆς Πλαταιέων πόλιος**: the 'island' between O^2 and O^3 was eminently 'in front of the city of the Plataians' to any one approaching Plataia by the road from Athens; it might also, however, though less appropriately, be so described from the point of view of the position occupied by the Greek forces 'on Gargaphia.'

νῆσος δὲ οὕτω ἂν εἴη ἐν ἠπείρῳ: the adverb *οὕτω* here = *ὧδε*, referring to what follows; cp. 8. 98. 4 (109. 12, 140. 34).

6. **σχιζόμενος**, being rent (in twain), 'dividing itself'; cp. 7. 31, 219, 8. 34; also 2. 17. Hdt. evidently conceives the Oëroë as first starting in a single channel, or stream, then parting into two and re-uniting, so as literally to form an island; cp. 2. 17 *μέχρι μέν νυν Κερκασώρου πόλιος ῥέει εἷς ἐὼν ὁ Νεῖλος, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς πόλιος σχίζεται τριφασίας ὁδούς.* Such (i.e. *διφασίας*

ῥέει κάτω ἐς τὸ πεδίον, διέχων ἀπ' ἀλλήλων τὰ ῥέεθρα ὅσον περ τρία στάδια, καὶ ἔπειτα συμμίσγει ἐς τὠυτό. οὔνομα δέ οἱ Ὠερόη· θυγατέρα δὲ ταύτην λέγουσι εἶναι Ἀσωποῦ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι. ἐς τοῦτον δὴ τὸν χῶρον ἐβουλεύσαντο μεταναστῆναι, ἵνα καὶ ὕδατι ἔχωσι χρᾶσθαι ἀφθόνῳ καὶ οἱ ἱππέες

7 ὅσον περὶ Marc.: ὅσον τε Krueger: ὅσον ἐπὶ? Stein^2 8 τοῦτο B 9 οἱ pr. loc.: ὁ RV 10 μεταστῆναι SV

ὁδοὺς σχίζεται) is not the case with the Oëroë, and probably never was. Hdt. is not writing from autopsy, or even from a cartographical survey! But such an eminent and conspicuous hill or mound between two streams, as *Ridge 4* now is, might easily be named an 'island' though not quite strictly speaking surrounded by water. Even the 'Pelopo-nesos' is only a peninsula; cp. 'Chersonese,' etc.

7. **ἐς τὸ πεδίον**: if Hdt. meant by these words to imply that 'the island' was down on 'the plain,' he would be giving further evidence of his ignorance of the ground. But need the phrase be so closely pressed? The river in any case is flowing down to the flat land.

διέχων, 'holding apart . .'; cp. προέχειν c. 4 *supra*. **τὰ ῥέεθρα** may here mean 'channels,' cp. 7. 130, and L. & S. *sub v.* ῥεῖθρον, but **ῥέει** above and **συμμίσγει** just below rather suggest 'streams'; and dry channels would not have been enough for the Greeks on this occasion.

ὅσον περ τρία στάδια: the measurement given is very exact (ὅσον περ, cp. ὅκως περ c. 120 *infra*), but only in one direction! How, then, is the distance of 3 stades reckoned, in latitude or in longitude? Is the island 3 stades long, or 3 stades broad? Unless the island were a rectangle, a square, it would seem that it must be its length that is given, and rectangular it could not be. On the other hand, a plot of land only 3 stades long (and probably not 3 stades wide) would have been far too small to receive the army. Not indeed that the whole forces need have been actually on 'the island' in the strictest sense. Dr. Grundy's island is considerably less than 3 stades wide, and indefinitely more than 3 stades long, but the actual mound might be about 3 stades long, which is perhaps what Hdt. would have said, had he measured, or even seen, the ground before writing.

9. **Ὠερόη**. Oëroë is a word of four syllables, and more than that! 'The men of those parts' in Hdt.'s time regarded Oëroë as 'a daughter of Asopos.' Hdt. need not have gone to Plataia to learn that. He might have met an ἐπιχώριος elsewhere. Thersander of Orchomenos (c. 16 *supra*) might have been his informant; or he might have read the statement in a geographical or mythological work; but it was probably the last thing a Plataian would have admitted. What was the sense of calling Oëroë a daughter of Asopos? Much the same as of saying that Thebe and Aigina were daughters of Asopos (cp. 5. 80). There is policy in it; the Oëroë region is claimed as part of the Παρασωπίς (cp. c. 15 *supra*). If this myth were intended for science, the hydrography is against it. Oëroë, the identity of which is certain, belongs to a different land-system to that of the Asopos, and sheds its waters to the west, down into the bay of Kreusis, not eastward to the Euboian sea.

The names of rivers are seldom feminine in Greek. Wesseling remarked that Oëroë is not included in the twelve daughters of Asopos by Diodoros 4. 72; cp. Apollod. 3. 11. 5. Only two of the names, Πειρήνη, Ἀσωπίς, could apply to springs, or streams. The latter perhaps might be the Oëroë (but that the Asopos with twelve daughters is the Phleiasian or Sekyonian, cp. c. 15. 13 *supra*).

10. **ἐβουλεύσαντο μεταναστῆναι**, 'they resolved after deliberation to migrate'; cp. μετανίστημι in Thuc. 1. 12. 1, 3. 114. 3; also the substantive μετανάστασις 1. 2. 1, 2. 16. 1.

Three motives for this move are given: (1) need of water-supply; (2) avoidance of the cavalry; (3) the relief of the commissariat-train, which was cooped up on Kithairon. All three reasons are so much homage to the dominance of the Persian cavalry, as is also further the determination to carry out the move under cover of night.

11. **ἵνα . . ἔχωσι . . καὶ . . μὴ**

σφέας μὴ σινοίατο ὥσπερ κατιθὺ ἐόντων· μετακινέεσθαι δὲ ἐδόκεε τότε ἐπεὰν τῆς νυκτὸς ᾖ δευτέρη φυλακή, ὡς ἂν μὴ

12 δὲ Stein[3]: τε

σινοίατο: a more immediate and a more remote, a more certain and a less certain, purpose or result, are indicated by the modal variation, cp. *ἢν μὲν δοκέῃ . . εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ δοκέοι* c. 48 *supra*.

12. **ὥσπερ κατιθὺ ἐόντων**, "as they did when they were directly exposed to them" (Blakesley); "as now, when they were right opposite" (Macaulay); "as when it was drawn up right in their front" (Rawlinson). **κατιθύ**, or *κατ' ἰθύ*, can hardly mean anything but 'right opposite.' To what subject is **ἐόντων** to be referred: *ἱππέων* out of *ἱππέες*, or *σφέων* out of *σφέας*? The material result, or argument, will be the same in either case—which perhaps accounts for the formal ambiguity. The argument is obscure. *A.* If Hdt. means that the cavalry was making frontal attacks upon the Greeks in their position (II.) 'on the Asopos,' the lie of the land is *prima facie* against him. It is not likely that the cavalry crossed the Asopos in front of the Greek position, and charged up the hill, halting and discharging their missiles, and then retired to a safe distance; for (*a*) this would require that bridges should have been laid across the river in many places, a proceeding of which there is no record; (*b*) this frontal attack would have no connexion with the destruction of Gargaphia and the water-supply in rear of the Greek position. *B.* If Hdt. means that frontal attacks by the cavalry were more to be dreaded than attacks on flank, or on rear (**κατὰ νώτου**), he would be saying what is manifestly absurd, and in contradiction with his own context. The frontal attacks at Erythrai failed; the flank and rear attacks by the Persian cavalry upon the Greek positions since the advance from Erythrai have been successful. *C.* Is it possible that *ὥσπερ κατιθὺ ἐόντων* here practically means that the Greeks were completely surrounded, and open to direct attack on all sides, though Hdt. himself may have repeated the phrase of his authority, or source, imperfectly and without fully understanding it? The actual fact was as suggested. In the position 'on the Asopos,' the position associated with the Androkrateion and Gargaphia, the Persian cavalry could attack the Greeks on all sides, more or less. The destruction of Gargaphia proves that the cavalry ranged freely behind the Greek position; the same fact is proved by the admission that the Greek connexions were cut, and that supplies could not reach them. In such a situation the Greeks cannot have maintained a formation on a single front, facing Asopos (north). The Greek army must necessarily have formed either in two lines back to back (*φάλαγξ ἀμφίστομος* Arrian *Tact.* 29) or in a hollow square, or parallelogram, round the Androkrateion; otherwise the Persian *Hippotoxotai* would have shot them down from the rear. (Though the south side of the 'Asopos Ridge' is steeper than the north slope, it is not inaccessible.) Especially the detachment told off to guard Gargaphia must have had such a formation. It is possible that the expression *ὥσπερ κατιθὺ ἐόντων* covers these facts. The *Nesos* was practically quite inaccessible for cavalry. *D.* Last, and least likely: the words might, ungrammatically, have reference to the new position about to be taken—they are in any case more or less incorrect—or may represent words in Hdt.'s source originally intended to mean that in the new position, *ἅτε κατιθὺ ἐσομένων* (sc. *ἀμφοτέρων τῶν στρατ.*), only frontal, and therefore less formidable, attacks will be possible. The grammatical obstacle to this interpretation is threefold: (1) the genitive absolute remains objectionable, as on every hypothesis; (2) *ὥσπερ* has to be made = *ὥστε, ἅτε*; (3) the present participle has to be taken as loosely equivalent to a future participle. These objections, fatal to this interpretation of the words as they stand, do not convince me that the phrase, as originally used by Hdt.'s authority, may not have had reference to the new position to be occupied, viz. the *νῆσος*.

13. **δευτέρῃ φυλακῇ**. The Romans certainly divided the night into four *vigiliae*; cp. Caesar, *B.G.* 1. 40, and Lewis & Short, *sub v. vigilia*. The Greek division is not so clear. Pollux 1. 70 is the main authority and might be taken to limit it to three (*περὶ πρώτας*

ἰδοίατο οἱ Πέρσαι ἐξορμωμένους καί σφεας ἐπόμενοι ταράσσοιεν οἱ ἱππόται. ἀπικομένων δὲ ἐς τὸν χῶρον τοῦτον, τὸν δὴ ἡ

---

14 *ἐξορμεομένους* Pz, Stein[1], van H.: *ἐξορμεωμένους* CMarc., Gaisford

---

φυλακὰς καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τρίτας). Suidas *sub v. φυλακή· τὸ τέταρτον μέρος τῆς νυκτός· τετραχῇ γὰρ διῄρηται*, has been assumed to be referring to the Roman system exclusively; but I think it more probable that the Greek system was practically identical with the Roman: thus in Pollux *l.c.* I. *νυκτὸς ἀρχή, περὶ πρώτην νύκτα, νυκτὸς ἀρχομένης* = *prima nocte, prima vigilia.* II. *περὶ πρῶτον ὕπνον* = *nocte concubia* (Tac. *Ann.* 1. 39), *secunda vigilia.* III. *μεσούσης νυκτός, μέσων νυκτῶν* = *nocte media, tertia vigilia.* IV. *περὶ ἀλεκτρυόνων ᾠδάς, ἀλεκτρυόνων ᾀδόντων, ὑπὸ τὸν ᾠδὸν ὄρνιθα* = *gallicinium, noctis gallicinio.* The words *καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τρίτας* in Pollux *l.c.* are out of place, and should not prejudice the question. The 'second watch' is very elaborately paraphrased in c. 44 *supra, ubi v.*, and 'the first watch' perhaps in 7. 215, *ubi v.* The exact length of the watch depended on the length of the night between sunset and sunrise, but was roughly two to three hours. The 'watches' in *Ev. Marc.* 13. 35 (*ἢ ὀψὲ ἢ μεσονυκτίον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἢ πρωΐ*) seem to exclude the *prima.* Is it not some confirmation of this fourfold division of the night, that the five terms in 4. 181 by which the time of day is marked give likewise a fourfold division? Obviously in the present case 'the first watch' was not dark enough for the intended movement of the Greeks: they meant to start about 10 P.M. apparently.

14. **ἐξορμωμένους**, 'starting,' in the act of moving out of position; cp. 7. 37, and esp. 7. 215 *ὁρμέατο . . ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου.*

ταράσσοιεν: as they had been doing most of the day; cp. c. 50 *τῆς στρατιῆς ὑπὸ τῆς ἵππου ταρασσομένης* etc. The confusion (*ταραχή*) was only confounded (*συνετάραξαν*) in the case of the fountain, c. 49 *supra*, or perhaps in the immediate vicinity of the fountain. There is here fresh admission of the efficiency of the Persian cavalry.

15. **ἀπικομένων δὲ ἐς τὸν χῶρον τοῦτον**: genitive absolute and participle keep up the mystery of the preceding crux, *ἐόντων supra*; the aorist here must be conditional, i.e. virtually future: in the dative (with *ἐδόκεε*) it would, of course, record their actual arrival at the island; in the genitive, it only continues the report of the council's decisions, to the effect that, 'on arrival at the island, they should still, under cover of night, despatch a division to Kithairon, etc. etc.' Whether this report be correct is, of course, another question.

τὸν δὴ ἡ Ἀσωπὶς [Ὠερόη] περισχίζεται. There is no difficulty in a verb, neuter or passive, compounded with *περί* taking the accusative (cp. *περιρρέω, περιρρήγνυμι*). The peculiarity here, however, arises from the preposition apparently having a sense in connexion with *τὸν χῶρον τοῦτον*, which is not strictly compatible with the meaning of the verb. Thus *περὶ τὸν ἡ Ἀσωπὶς σχίζεται* would mean simply that at this point the Asopis divides, or is split, into two streams; cp. Plato, *Tim.* 21 E *ἔστι τις κατ' Αἴγυπτον, ἦ δ' ὅς, ἐν τῷ Δέλτα, περὶ ὃ κατὰ κορυφὴν σχίζεται τὸ τοῦ Νείλου ῥεῦμα, Σαϊτικὸς ἐπικαλούμενος νομός κτλ. σχίζεσθαι περί τι* marks a point, not a region; but here the idea of 'surrounding' seems suggested: the *νῆσος* is not a point, or a *κορυφή*, on which the Asopis splits, but an oblong figure, or *χῶρος*, which it surrounds. Had *περιρρέειν* been the verb here, no one would have felt a difficulty. Thus 7. 214 *περιηγησάμενοι τὸ ὄρος τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι*: 1. 84 *περιενειχθέντος τοῦ λέοντος τὸ τεῖχος*: 4. 180 *παρθένον . . περιάγουσι τὴν λίμνην* do not clear this case, the difficulty lying not in the *περί* but in the *σχίζεται.* If Hdt. had written *σχιζομένη* or *σχισθεῖσα περιρρέει*, instead of *ῥέουσα περισχίζεται*, the phrase would have been unimpeachable. Hdt. is here a little befogged in his phraseology (like the man who 'boiled an icicle' instead of 'oiling a bicycle,' yet not so badly as that!); cp. c. 55 *infra.* Polybios, 3. 42. 7, shows a much clearer head: *οἱ ποιησάμενοι τὴν πορείαν ἀντίοι τῷ ῥεύματι . . παραγενόμενοι πρός τινα τόπον, ἐν ᾧ συνέβαινε περί τι χωρίον νησίζον περισχίζεσθαι τὸν ποταμόν, ἐνταῦθα κατέμειναν* (Hannibal's crossing of the Rhone).

Ἀσωπὶς [Ὠερόη] περισχίζεται ῥέουσα ἐκ τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος, ὑπὸ τὴν νύκτα ταύτην ἐδόκεε τοὺς ἡμίσεας ἀποστέλλειν τοῦ στρατοπέδου πρὸς τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα, ὡς ἀναλάβοιεν τοὺς ὀπέωνας τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ σιτία οἰχομένους· ἦσαν γὰρ ἐν τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι ἀπολελαμμένοι.

---

16 nomen seclusi || σχίζεται S || ἐκ τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος del. Gomperz, Holder 18 ὀπάονας R : ὀπαῶνας S 19 ἔσαν *z*

---

16. **ὑπὸ τὴν νύκτα ταύτην**: i.e. apparently 'before daybreak'; yet *ὑπὸ νύκτα* is generally taken to mean 'about nightfall,' towards night, as night comes on. The temporal indication must qualify not *ἐδόκεε* (for the date of which see above) but *ἀποστέλλειν*.

17. **ἐδόκεε** repeats the *ἐδόκεε* just above; but the change to the imperfects, after *ἐβουλεύσαντο* and *ἔδοξε*, in the report of the proceedings of one and the same council, looks as though (1) the precise time of departure, (2) the operations projected for the *ἀπόστολος στρατός* (so to speak, cp. *τοὺς ἡμίσεας ἀποστέλλειν infra*), were less clearly, less definitely resolved, expressed, understood, than the previous question of retreat, and retreat to the 'island' as a new halting-place. Anyway, these imperfects introduce resolutions which were very imperfectly realized.

τοὺς ἡμίσεας ἀποστέλλειν τοῦ στρατοπέδου πρὸς τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα: a most curious statement: it was resolved, or was in a way to be resolved, that after the whole army had reached the island, the half of the army should be further despatched to Kithairon, in order to convoy, relieve, the attendants who had gone away to fetch supplies (cp. c. 50 *supra*). Which half of the army was to be despatched on this service? To what part of Kithairon was it to go? Was it really proposed to bisect the army? One half would have comprised (presumably) either (*a*) the right wing and right centre, 22,800 men; or (*b*) the left wing and left centre, 15,900 men; or (*c*) the two wings together, 20,100 men; or (*d*) the right and left centre, 18,600 men. Cp. the tactical disposition and figures as given and annotated c. 28 *supra*. There is no clear indication which of these four alternatives is intended. But as in the sequel the whole centre moves back far beyond the two wings, while the two wings attempt to form up in one, though unsuccessfully, it is best to understand by *τοὺς ἡμίσεας* in this passage the right and left centre (cp. cc. 52, 69 *infra*) (or else, one half only of the centre?). The whole plan, then, is apparently that the two divisions of the centre should retire *πρὸς τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα*, while the right and left wings, i.e. the Lakedaimonians with the Tegeatai and the Athenians with the Plataians, should concentrate back on to the island. To what point on Kithairon was the centre to retire? Were they to go back on to the Plataio-Megarian pass, and to protect and convoy the *ὀπέωνες* and the *σιτία* down the pass, and to the island? The Persian cavalry was in command and possession of Dryoskephalai and the two routes, or passes, therefrom on to the plain, or the *ὑπωρέη*. Was the centre to attempt the recovery, or the reopening of the loop from 'Three Heads' to Plataia? The centre was to be detached upon a service apparently which was the less hazardous; they were to retire first, they were to retire furthest, they were to retire in a compact body, leaving the two wings in the dark to find or keep touch of each other, and to concentrate back on to the island, from their isolated positions at the two extremities of the existing line. It showed some confidence in the virtues of the centre to charge them with that service, as they might have gone clean off (like Artabazos on the other side?) from the battle-field: in the sequel they did good service. One thing is manifest: Hdt. has not fully conceived the precise meaning of the traditions which he reports; but, as often, the report is sufficiently full and faithful to yield the facts to a critical reconstruction.

18. **ἀναλάβοιεν**: a remarkable use of this flexible word; cp. 7. 231, 8. 109.

19. **ἦσαν γὰρ ἐν τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι ἀπολελαμμένοι**, 'they were on Kithairon unable to make further progress.' *ἀπολαμβάνειν*: cp. c. 38 *supra*, etc. Hdt. uses perf. pass. *ἀπολέλαμμαι* (not *ἀπει-*

Ταῦτα βουλευσάμενοι κείνην μὲν τὴν ἡμέρην πᾶσαν προσκειμένης τῆς ἵππου εἶχον πόνον ἄτρυτον· ὡς δὲ ἥ τε ἡμέρη ἔληγε καὶ οἱ ἱππέες ἐπέπαυντο, νυκτὸς δὴ γινομένης καὶ ἐούσης τῆς ὥρης ἐς τὴν συνέκειτό σφι ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι, ἐνθαῦτα ἀερθέντες οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπαλλάσσοντο, ἐς μὲν τὸν χῶρον ἐς τὸν συνέκειτο οὐκ ἐν νόῳ ἔχοντες, οἳ δὲ ὡς ἐκινήθησαν ἔφευγον **52**

---

52. 1 ἐκείνην **B** || προκειμένης (C)RS 2 ἔχον z 3 νυκτός τε vel νυκτός τε δὴ ? Stein[1] 4 θεούσης **a**C || τὴν δὴ **B**, Holder, van H. 5 ἀπαλλάσσοντο om. Marc. || ἐς ὃν **a**C 6 ὡς : ἐς C

λημμαι). ἦσαν is here more than a mere auxiliary, and ἦσαν ἀπολελαμμένοι more than merely ἀπελελάμφατο (?). Hdt. does not specify upon what part of Kithairon the supply train was arrested, or cut off, or prevented from advancing —by the Persian cavalry, or the fear thereof. He nowhere shows any clear knowledge of a pass direct from Plataia to Megara.

52. 1. **ταῦτα βουλευσάμενοι . . πᾶσαν**: the natural inferences from this sequence were that the Council took place early, and that the cavalry assaults continued for the whole day after. But that inference would be inconsistent with cc. 49, 50 *supra* where the Council is only summoned *τούτων τοιούτων ἐόντων*, or at least *τούτου δὲ τοιούτου γινομένου*. 'All the day' means (*a*) 'all the rest of that day,' or (*b*) simply 'all day,' to signify that after the Council, as before, the *ταραχὴ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱππέων* continued. The day is still the 12th, which dawned in c. 47 *supra*. There has been nothing to justify the insertion of one or more days between the dawn there and the night here. **κείνην**, indeed, places the **πόνον ἄτρυτον** and the *βουλήν* upon the same day. **ἄτρυτος** is a poetic word, with *α* intensive; Pindar, *Pyth.* 4. 174, has the same phrase, *ἄτρυτος πόνος*, but not in quite the same sense (*πέμπε δ' Ἑρμᾶς χρυσόραπις διδύμους υἱοὺς ἐπ' ἄτρυτον πόνον*).

2. **ἥ τε ἡμέρη ἔληγε**, 'towards evening on the 12th.' *λήγειν* here of time, as of space 7. 216; cp. 4. 39. Xenoph. *Anab.* 7. 6. 6 has *αὕτη μὲν ἡ ἡμέρα οὕτως ἔληξε*. **οἱ ἱππέες ἐπέπαυντο**: sc. *προσκείμενοι*, or *προσβάλλοντες*, or *ταράσσοντες τὴν στρατιήν*, as they have been doing all day. The use of the pluperfect after the imperfect is noticeable; the cavalry attacks came to an end before the daylight. But Hdt. uses a material auxiliary, and not the pure pluperfect (*προσεβεβλήκεσαν*, or possibly *προσεβεβλέατο*, cp. 6. 24) to signify the cesser of the attacks.

3. **νυκτὸς δὴ γινομένης** would serve to mark the first watch, *νυκτὸς ἀρχή, καὶ περὶ πρώτην νύκτα, καὶ νυκτὸς ἀρχομένης καὶ περὶ πρώτας φυλακάς*, Pollux, 1. 70, cp. c. 51 *supra*.

4. **ἐούσης τῆς ὥρης ἐς τὴν συνέκειτο**: i.e. *δευτέρης φυλακῆς* c. 51 *supra*, sc. *περὶ πρῶτον ὕπνον* Pollux *l.c.*, cp. c. 44 *supra*. The word *ὥρη* here comes very near to our word 'hour,' *τὸ δυωδεκατὸν μέρος τῆς ἡμέρης* (*sive νυκτός*), cp. 2. 109.

5. **ἀερθέντες οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπαλλάσσοντο**: the participle and the subject both strike a depreciatory, a dyslogistic, a sarcastic note, which is immediately followed by still more damnatory clauses. *ἀερθέντες* (*ἀείρειν, αἴρειν*) is used in 1. 165, 170 (also in 4. 150 *βαρὺς ἀείρεσθαι*) in a technical way of sea-faring, starting on a sea-voyage, *νηυσί* perhaps, or *ἱστίοις*, being understood; or even *τὰ ἱστία*, cp. 8. 56, 94. Here, then, 'the masses' or 'the mass' of the army departs under full sail! (This might be an Athenian touch.) *οἱ πολλοί* here presumably corresponds exactly to *τοὺς ἡμίσεας* in c. 51 *supra*. They are not, strictly speaking, in the majority: the whole centre numbers 18,600 as compared with 20,100 for the two wings; as compared with either wing alone, however, and especially the left (8600), the centre has a large plurality.

ἐς τὸν συνέκειτο repeats with a touch of persiflage the *ἐς τὴν συνέκειτο* just above; the construction is, of course, neuter. (Contr. *προσκειμένης* higher up. Hdt. is not over careful to avoid such inconcinnities, or 'unconscious iterations.')

6. **οὐκ ἐν νόῳ ἔχοντες** marks their duplicity (like the Spartans c. 54), 'hav-

ἅσμενοι τὴν ἵππον πρὸς τὴν Πλαταιέων πόλιν, φεύγοντες δὲ ἀπικνέονται ἐπὶ τὸ Ἥραιον· τὸ δὲ πρὸ τῆς πόλιος ἐστὶ τῆς

8 ἡραῖον RS || δὴ **B** || τῆς : τῶν Marc.

ing no intention'—not having it in their minds, sc. ἀπαλλάξασθαι (or even ἀπικέσθαι) to the *rendezvous*, the appointed place; i.e. no doubt in the view of Hdt. himself, as of his source, the island. But the previous chapter shows that the division, or divisions, here in question were to retire πρὸς τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα—much further than the island. They probably did exactly what had been agreed upon at the Council of War.

οἳ δέ: the subject repeated with the δέ which might more usually go with the verb, to emphasize their action: 'but they . . ' Cp. 7. 51.

ὡς ἐκινήθησαν ἔφευγον, 'were no sooner in movement than they took to their heels, leaving to their joy the Persian cavalry far behind!'

The representation of this ἀπάλλαξις (cp. c. 13 *supra*) as a φυγή (*bis*) is the clearest indication of the *animus* of Hdt.'s source, and of his own simplicity, in reproducing his authority.

7. **πρὸς τὴν Πλαταιέων πόλιν**: the city of Plataia was no doubt in ruins (cp. 8. 50 *supra*), though its site and its remains might offer some cover (on the morrow) from the dreadful Persian cavaliers. The story, however, goes on to relate that in the course of their flight (**φεύγοντες δέ**), and before they actually reached the (ruins of) the city of Plataia, they arrived at the temple of Hera (perhaps in ruins too), and there, in front of the temple, they halted, with the utmost precision! Had they been in 'flight' they would not have stopped there, nor do fugitives pile arms and take laager: they throw their arms away, and bolt. The division which halted (presumably according to orders) at the Heraion, perhaps comprised only the left centre, οἱ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας τε καὶ Φλειασίους c. 69 *infra*, 7300 strong; at the Heraion the left centre was perhaps in a better position ἀναλαβεῖν τοὺς ὀπέωνας, cp. c. 51 *supra*. Further, the right centre, in this case, οἱ ἀμφὶ Κορινθίους c. 69 *infra*, 11,300 strong, may either have gone higher up Kithairon, in order to bring forward the σιτία, or have been posted on the road leading from Plataia to Dryoskephalai, to protect both the rear of the forces on the island and the flank of the baggage-train, coming down the pass from Megara. In that position they may subsequently have had some fighting to do.

8. **τὸ Ἥραιον**: the temple of Hera was in front of the πόλις, i.e. the Akropolis of the Plataians, 20 stades from the fountain of Gargaphia. The site of the Heraion has been fixed with high probability by the excavations of Mr. Henry S. Washington; see *Papers of the American School at Athens*, vi. (1897), pp. 40-54. Its position is almost in the very centre of the plateau of Plataia, the southern end of which alone constituted the πόλις even in 429 B.C. Even at that date there were perhaps no other buildings on the site. The restored Plataia of Makedonian, Roman, and later times covered the whole plateau, as the extant remains of the city-walls demonstrate (cp. *Papers of the A.S.A.* v. (1892) pp. 253 ff.), and must have enclosed the *Heraion*, the site of which, in 479 B.C., was certainly outside the city-walls, lower down on the larger northern portion of the table. Any one from the north side would describe the site as πρὸ τῆς πόλιος, and the Plataians themselves, or any one following their terminology, would use the same language (cp. 8. 53), which would also be not unsuitable from the point of view of the supposed 'fugitives' in this story. It is very doubtful, however (to my mind), whether the Heraion was standing in the year 479 B.C., or even at the time when Hdt. was writing. The Persians had probably destroyed it in 480 B.C. (cp. 8. 50). If so, it was in ruins at the time of the battle. At the second destruction of Plataia by the Thebans, in 426 B.C., it is not recorded that they destroyed the Heraion, but it is recorded that they built a great inn, or khan, round a courtyard 200 feet square (for the reception of pilgrims), dedicating it and its furniture to Hera, καὶ νεὼν ἑκατόμπεδον λίθινον ᾠκοδόμησαν αὐτῇ Thuc. 3. 68. 3. This was probably the very temple (**ναός**) which Pausanias (9. 2. 7) found within the restored and enlarged city of his time, θέας ἄξιος μεγέθει τε καὶ ἐς τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τὸν κοσμόν.

Πλαταιέων, εἴκοσι σταδίους ἀπὸ τῆς κρήνης τῆς Γαργαφίης ἀπέχον· ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἔθεντο πρὸ τοῦ ἱροῦ τὰ ὅπλα. καὶ οἱ **53**
μὲν περὶ τὸ Ἥραιον ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο, Παυσανίης δὲ ὁρῶν σφεας ἀπαλλασσομένους ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου παρήγγελλε καὶ

---

9 γαρσαφίης S **53.** 2 ἰρὸν **B** || ὁρέων CPz, Stein[1], van H. 3 παρήγγελε z

---

But though a *Hekatompedon*, and built on or over the foundations discovered by Mr. Washington, the restored temple was perhaps not so long as the earlier (sixth century) building, to judge by the measurements. It is not likely that the Thebans destroyed a temple which had been restored since the Persian war; nor is any account of a temple in such a position made by Thucydides in his stories of the siege in 429–7 B.C. Probably the Heraion had not been restored, but was purposely left in ruins, as an eternal protest against the Persian spoiler (and his Greek allies; hence the Theban restoration of 426 B.C.). The temple built by the Plataians out of the spoil of the battle of 479 B.C. was a temple to Athene (the Thebans did not destroy that), Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 20, Pausan. 9. 4. 1. Hdt. in this connexion too shows no sign of having visited Plataia before writing his account of the battle.

9. **εἴκοσι σταδίους**: these distances in decimals are quite unconvincing, but might pass for rough estimates, say, 2½ miles. By mere map measurement the Heraion is about 15 stades from *Apotripi*, and 18 from Dr. Grundy's Gargaphia, and would be a good 20 stades from the Greek position round the Androkrateion. Why is Gargaphia here specified as the *terminus a quo*? that was rather the Spartan post and point of departure. **ἀπέχειν**, intrans. with acc. of distance, is of course a sufficiently common construction, cp. 1. 179 *ἄλλη πόλις ἀπέχουσα ὀκτὼ ἡμερέων ὁδὸν ἀπὸ Βαβυλῶνος*, 3. 26 *ἀπέχουσι δὲ ἑπτὰ ἡμερέων ὁδὸν ἀπὸ Θηβέων*.

10. **ἔθεντο πρὸ τοῦ ἱροῦ τὰ ὅπλα**, 'they piled arms in front of the temple'—an admission in itself sufficient to disprove the insinuation of *φυγή*. The Greek centre, or perhaps only the left centre, must now be conceived as posted *περὶ τὸ Ἥραιον*, on the lower or northern end of the Plataian plateau, with the heavy shields piled *πρὸ τοῦ ἱροῦ*. In this position they are unassailable by cavalry; they are in proximity to water (at least four springs or brooks in the immediate vicinity of the plateau, cp. *Papers A.S.A.* v. 1892, p. 269); they are covering to a greater or less extent the road from Plataia to Megara. They are also apparently on the extreme left of the 'third' Greek position, which is to be when the whole manœuvre shall have been successfully carried out. But they are not actually convoying the baggage-train, *ὀπέωνες* and *σιτία*, nor in any way covering the line from Plataia to Dryoskephalai, through which the Persians might possibly circumvent the supplies. That particular duty may have been entrusted to the right centre; cp. note to l. 7 above.

53. 2. **Παυσανίης δὲ ὁρῶν.** Hdt. speaks as though Pausanias himself had not issued, or agreed to, the order for retirement; as though *οἱ πολλοί* were stampeding out of laager, or station; as though in consequence he issued orders to the Lakedaimonians to retreat. **ὁρῶν**, however, need not be pressed against Hdt., cp. c. 34. 9 *supra* (= *μαθών*). Pausanias could hardly have 'seen' the movement, in the literal sense of the word.

3. **παρήγγελλε καὶ τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι**: the Spartan method of the *παράγγελσις* has been immortalized by Thucydides, 5. 66. 3: *βασιλέως γὰρ ἄγοντος ὑπ' ἐκείνου πάντα ἄρχεται, καὶ τοῖς μὲν πολεμάρχοις αὐτὸς φράζει τὸ δέον, οἱ δὲ τοῖς λοχαγοῖς, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τοῖς πεντηκοντῆρσιν, αὖθις δὲ οὗτοι τοῖς ἐνωμοτάρχαις, καὶ οὗτοι τῇ ἐνωμοτίᾳ. καὶ αἱ παραγγέλσεις, ἤν τι βούλωνται, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ χωροῦσι καὶ ταχεῖαι ἐπέρχονται· σχέδον γάρ τι πᾶν πλὴν ὀλίγου τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἄρχοντες ἀρχόντων εἰσί, καὶ τὸ ἐπιμελὲς τοῦ δρωμένου πολλοῖς προσήκει.* On the present occasion, however, as the whole movement had been discussed and determined in the Council of War hours before (cp. c. 51 *supra*), one must suppose that all the necessary orders had already been given, at least to the officers. Pausanias may still have had to give the word for the actual moment of departure.

τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἀναλαβόντας τὰ ὅπλα ἰέναι κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς προϊόντας, νομίσας αὐτοὺς ἐς τὸν χῶρον ἰέναι ἐς τὸν συνεθήκαντο. ἐνθαῦτα οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ἄρτιοι ἦσαν τῶν ταξιάρχων πείθεσθαι Παυσανίῃ, Ἀμομφάρετος δὲ ὁ Πολιάδεω λοχηγέων τοῦ Πιτανητέων λόχου οὐκ ἔφη τοὺς ξείνους φεύ-

6 *ἔσαν* z   7 *ταξιαρχέων* **B** : *ταξιηρχέων* z ‖ Ἀμομφάρετος δὲ om. C 8 *λοχηγετέων* z : om. Marc. ‖ *Πιτανήτεω* Koen, Holder, van H.

4. **ἀναλαβόντας τὰ ὅπλα** : the shields were piled, but of course there must have been some men under arms, if only those on the watch.

ἰέναι κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους can hardly have been the precise form of the commander's order, but rather gives the effect of the order, as the writer conceived that effect. With the expression cp. c. 89 *infra*, *κατὰ πόδας ἐμεῦ ἐλαύνων*.

5. **νομίσας αὐτοὺς . . ἐς τὸν συνεθήκαντο**, 'for he believed the others to be going to the place agreed upon,' i.e., according to Hdt., the island: *συνεθήκαντο*, sc. *ἰέναι*. The 'agreement' had been made at the Council of War, c. 51 *supra*. Hdt. describes (i.e. follows an authority which conceived) the movements of the Greek army in the field of battle as the results of compacts, agreements, bargains, argument, persuasion, but not of definite orders, originating from headquarters or the commander-in-chief. In any case the result of his *παράγγελμα* to the 'Lakedaimonians' (10,000 strong) must have been to set *Λακεδαιμονίων ἅπαν τὸ στρατόπεδον* in motion, unless indeed the order was addressed only to a portion of the forces.

6. **οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι . . τῶν ταξιάρχων** : not *ταξιαρχέων*. *ταξίαρχος* is the usual Attic form of the word. The term is not a Spartan one at all. All but one of these good Spartan officers, whatever their proper title, were willing and ready (**ἄρτιοι**, cp. c. 27 *supra*) to obey their commander ! No very astonishing circumstance in an army where *πειθαρχία* was so sedulously enforced as in the Spartan (cp. Xenophon, *Lac. Rep.* 8).

7. **Ἀμομφάρετος δὲ ὁ Πολιάδεω** : Amompharetos is hardly a mere *Ehrenname* (Stein) ; a Spartan of the name appears as one of the five arbitrators in the early Megaro-Athenian dispute about Salamis, Busolt ii.[2] (1895) 248 ; cp. Plutarch, *Solon* 10. The younger might be a grandson, or descendant, of the elder Amompharetos. But those are the only two known wearers of the name. The (father's) name Poliades is found elsewhere, but not again at Sparta. If Pape - Benseler *sub v.* is correct in deriving it from Athene *Πολιάς*, the Spartan might have been named by his father in compliment to Athens ; cp. the case of the Spartan *Σάμιος* 3. 55. Was there even perhaps an Athenian *ξενία* or *προξενία* in the family ?

8. **λοχηγέων**, 'occupying the rank of a *Lochagos*,' or commander of a Lochos, a strictly Spartan office and command. But the exact duty and rank of a *Lochagos* are not so clear. In Xenophon *Rep. Lac.* 11. 4 a *λόχος* is one-quarter of a *μόρα*, and there are six *μόραι* in the army, each apparently under the command of a *Polemarchos*. That would give a total of 24 *Lochoi*. In an army of 5000 that total allows about 292 men to the *Lochos*. But Xenophon is writing in the fourth century, when a Spartan army in the field never approached a strength of 5000. The numerical strength of Spartan divisions varied with the levy probably. The Spartan *Mora* destroyed in the Korinthian war numbered 600 men, Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 5. 11–12. If it consisted of four *Lochoi*, the *Lochos* was numbering 150 men, but there may have been six *Lochoi* of 100 men each in it. Thucydides, writing of the battle of Mantineia (418 B.C.), with the air of an eye-witness, expressly notices the difficulty of ascertaining the exact number of men in a Spartan force. He uses the term *λόχος* apparently for the division commanded by a Polemarch (perhaps only under exceptional circumstances), and makes the army of Agis on that occasion consist of 7 *Lochoi*, exclusive of the *Skiritai* 600 strong. It is obvious that the *Lochos* in that passage corresponds to the *Mora* of Xenophon, a term not employed by Thucydides (cp. *Hell.* 2. 4. 31, earliest case) ; the number 7 remains a problem, which Arnold in-

ξεσθαι οὐδὲ ἑκὼν εἶναι αἰσχυνέειν τὴν Σπάρτην, ἐθώμαζέ

---

9 ἐθώυμαζέ Pz, Stein[1]

---

geniously solves by the hypothesis that the army really consisted of six divisions, together with the corps of Βρασίδειοι and Νεωδαμώδεις. (Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* i.[2] 77, 1893, apparently identifies this corps with the Skiritai, and gives up the number of *Lochoi* as hopeless.) In the *Lochos* at Mantineia there were four πεντηκοστύες, each consisting in turn of four ἐνωμοτίαι. If the numerical strength of the *Pentekostys* necessarily and always corresponded to its name, that would give but 200 men to the *Lochos*, and (roughly) but 12 to the *Enomotia*; but on the possibility of variations in the numbers of men composing the various subdivisions, Arnold's note to Thucydides *in l.* (of which G. Gilbert, for example, took no account) is still worth consulting. The normal number of the *Enomotia* is not really quite certain, it may have been 15 (cp. Gilbert, *op. c.* 75, n. 4), it may have been 24, besides the captain, as Arnold supposes; but it is certain that the tactical organization of the Spartan army underwent modification not merely between the time of Thucydides and of Xenophon, but between the time of Herodotos and of Thucydides; nor is it to be supposed that the indications of the narrative in Hdt. will correspond exactly with the traditions of the Lykurgean system. An army of 5000 men might very well consist of 5 *Lochoi* of 1000 men each; and as a matter of fact 5 is the number of *Lochoi* suggested by some of the authorities for the older period (say, sixth century), cp. Gilbert, *op. c.* p. 76. A *Lochos* of 1000 men would probably have been subdivided into 10 companies of 100 each, possibly 'double *Pentekostyes*,' such as Arnold speaks of (possibly even, though to my thinking less probably, also called *Lochoi* as he suggests). Amompharetos is emphatically not one of the 'Polemarchs' (cp. 7. 173), but may have been in command of 1000 men. He was no mere 'centurion,' or the story that follows could hardly have been told about him.

τοῦ Πιτανητέων λόχου. Thucydides, still in this respect employing the same terminology as Hdt., goes out of his way to assert that it was an error to say that there was, 'or ever had been,' a Πιτανάτης λόχος (cp. just below) in the Spartan army, 1. 20. 3. Whether Thucydides is contraverting the source from which Hdt. gets this story, or, as seems likely enough, Hdt. himself, the express assertion of the Athenian on this matter is final, if rightly understood. But what does Thucydides exactly mean? Not that the Spartan army was not organized κατὰ λόχους, for that would contradict his own text elsewhere, but either that the λόχοι had not territorial designations, or that no λόχος derived its designation from Πιτάνη (cp. 3. 55). The recorded names of *Lochoi* are territorial, at least in part, e.g. Μεσοάτης (cp. Gilbert, *op. c.* p. 76 n. 3); so that we may conclude in favour of the latter alternative. If Amompharetos was a δημότης of Pitana, a Πιτανάτης, and commanded one of the *Lochoi* in the Spartan army, an Athenian source might very probably speak of the division under his command as the Πιτανάτης λόχος, especially if, as above argued, the family of this Pitanate was likely to be known and popular in Athens.

Hdt. himself calls Πιτάνη a δῆμος, rather an Atticism than a Laconism, 3. 55. Pausanias (3. 16. 9) seems to put Pitane and Mesoa in juxtaposition (οἱ) ἐκ Μεσόας τε καὶ Πιτάνης θύοντες τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι: and the mistake censured by Thucydides may lie in calling the Μεσοάτης λόχος the Πιτανάτης. Pitana itself was evidently a considerable place: Pausanias (3. 14. 2) mentions a λέσχη Κροτανῶν in the vicinity of the Royal Tombs of the Agiadai, adding εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ Κροτανοὶ Πιτανατῶν μοῖρα. This makes Pitane in the west end of Sparta: the Artemis above named is Artemis Issoria, Pausan. *l.c.* (cp. Wide, *Lakonische Kulte*, 1893, p. 109). Close by were the tombs of Leonidas and Pausanias the Regent, and the monument to the 300 who fell at Thermopylai (cp. 7. 224).

The story of Amompharetos may well belong to the first draft of Hdt.'s work. It is a superficial inference that Hdt. got this story of Amompharetos in Pitane, during his visit to Sparta: the story is plainly not a Spartan story, it is almost as plainly an Athenian. There is nothing in the story to show that

τε ὁρῶν τὸ ποιεύμενον ἅτε οὐ παραγενόμενος τῷ προτέρῳ λόγῳ. ὁ δὲ Παυσανίης τε καὶ ὁ Εὐρυάναξ δεινὸν μὲν ἐποιεῦντο τὸ μὴ πείθεσθαι ἐκεῖνον σφίσι, δεινότερον δὲ ἔτι, κείνου ταῦτ' ἀναινομένου, ἀπολιπεῖν τὸν λόχον τὸν Πιτανήτην, μὴ ἢν ἀπολίπωσι ποιεῦντες τὰ συνεθήκαντο τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἕλλησι,

---

10 ὁρέων Stein[1,2], van H. 12 δ' ἔτι **a**Cz ‖ ἐκείνου **B** ‖ ταῦτα νενωμένου **B**, Wesseling, Gaisford 13 πιτανίτην C

Hdt. had been in Sparta before writing it down, rather the reverse. If Hdt. afterwards made friends in Pitane it was perhaps because he took introductions from Athens; but he either did not discover his mistake about the Πιτανάτης λόχος, or he failed to correct it. If the emperor Caracalla (211–217 A.D.) before starting for the east sent for a body-guard from Sparta and called it the Πιτανάτης λόχος (Herodian 4. 8. 3), that only shows how hard an error dies which has once attained classic expression in literature. If Photius, *Lex. sub v.* Πιτάνη, has φυλὴ καὶ τόπος τῆς Λακωνικῆς, that is because in the Roman period the name had been adopted for a local tribe; cp. *C.I.G.* 1425–6.

τοὺς ξείνους: cc. 11 *supra*, 55 *infra*.

9. **ἑκὼν εἶναι**: cp. 7. 164.

10. **ὁρῶν τὸ ποιεύμενον**: cp. 1. 2 *supra*. Amompharetos could hardly 'see' in the dark; he no doubt received certain orders (probably to stay where he was, or to cover the retreat).

ἅτε οὐ παραγενόμενος τῷ προτέρῳ λόγῳ: the πρότερος λόγος in this case is the Council of War in cc. 50 f. *supra*. The phrase does not necessarily imply that there was any fresh council or discussion now taking place. If Amompharetos was really absent from the previous Council it was not because he was not a sufficiently high officer to be present, but for some other reason. Stein suggests that he was in command of an important out-post; but which? And had he retired from it? The army had been *ex hypothesi* all together, and in battle-array. How also does Amompharetos now come to be back in the Laager? A statement of this sort, explanatory or rather assertorial of his absence from the Council, is very suspicious; it is argumentative, and apologetic, to meet the obvious objection to the story, that Amompharetos must have known all about the intended movement from having been present at the Council earlier in the day. (It is just conceivable that a Spartan *Lochos*, under Amompharetos, or some other, might have been posted in or about the church of St. Demetrion; but the position would have been a dangerously isolated one, as the detachment could not have kept touch of the forces on the Asopos Ridge, with the Persian cavalry riding up and down the valleys or combes between the ridges; or he might have been holding or trying to hold Gargaphia: in which case he had retired before the strangers already.)

11. **ὁ δὲ Παυσανίης τε καὶ ὁ Εὐρυάναξ**: why Euryanax (c. 10 *supra*) here suddenly comes by his apparent rights it is not easy to say; down below, c. 55, he even takes precedence. Does this 'Attic' story tend to discredit both Spartan commanders at the expense of Amompharetos? The Spartan commanders were shocked at his insubordination, but still more horrified at the idea of abandoning him to his fate.

δεινὸν ποιέεσθαι, a mental process, or condition; cp. 7. 1.

12. **κείνου ταῦτ' ἀναινομένου**: i.e. so long as Amompharetos refused to retire: ἀναλαβόντας τὰ ὅπλα ἰέναι . . ἐς τὴν νῆσον. The verb ἀναίνομαι is common in Homer, and not unknown even in Attic prose. (Cp. App. Crit.)

13. **τὸν λόχον τὸν Πιτανήτην**: see above.

ἢν ἀπολίπωσι: sc. τὸν λόχον.

14. **ποιεῦντες τὰ συνεθήκαντο τ. ἄλ. Ἕλλησι**, 'in carrying out their agreement with all the other Greeks.' But the centre, if the Spartans had only known it, had, as already recorded, been guilty of a gross and dastardly breach of faith; the only other Greeks, therefore, now worth considering are—as the reader knows—the Athenians.

ἀπόληται ὑπολειφθεὶς αὐτός τε Ἀμομφάρετος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ. ταῦτα λογιζόμενοι ἀτρέμας εἶχον τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Λακωνικόν, καὶ ἐπειρῶντο πείθοντές μιν ὡς οὐ χρεὸν εἴη ταῦτα ποιέειν. καὶ οἳ μὲν παρηγόρεον Ἀμομφάρετον μοῦνον 54
Λακεδαιμονίων τε καὶ Τεγεητέων λελειμμένον, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐποίευν τοιάδε· εἶχον ἀτρέμας σφέας αὐτοὺς ἵνα ἐτάχθησαν, ἐπιστάμενοι τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων φρονήματα ὡς ἄλλα φρονεόντων

15 ὑποληφθεὶς RV 17 ἐπειρώτων SMarc. : ἐπειρέοντο van H. || χρεὼν CPz, van H. **54.** 1 παρηγορέοντο Bekker, van H. || μούνων B 3 ἀτρέμα **α**

16. **ἀτρέμας εἶχον τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Λ.** As the order to march had already been issued, the *modus operandi* here is not quite clear. Either the order to march had not yet taken effect, and was countermanded; or the van, or a portion of the line, had indeed started, and was arrested by a message from headquarters. It is, of course, not impossible that the army was falling back *en échelon*, Lochos by Lochos; and that the 'Mesoate' Lochos, or the Lochos under the command of the Pitanate Amompharetos, being at the extremity of the Spartan wing, was the last to retire. The process would be a pretty slow one, carried out, as it was being carried out, in the dark; and daylight might overtake them (c. 56 *infra*) before the whole manœuvre had been fully executed.

ἀτρέμας ἔχειν: cp. 7. 8.

17. **ἐπειρῶντο πείθοντες**: c. 26 *supra*.

54. 2. **Ἀθηναῖοι δέ.** The previous chapter has witnessed the Greek centre in full 'flight'—to the Heraion: *ex hypothesi* a disgraceful 'breach of contract.' The Spartans have equally broken faith, by not retreating at all, so far: the commanders being involved in a dispute with a refractory *Lochagos*, whom they would not abandon, with his men, to fate. **μοῦνον . . λελειμμένον** just here is a rhetorical exaggeration: the participle, passive and perfect in form, must be middle and present, or imperfect, in sense; cp. 7. 153. The tense at least marks his obstinacy. Meanwhile what of the Athenians? Were they keeping their contract, were they true to their word? The story goes on to admit (it is an Athenian story) that they were forsworn; but, then, they had a good excuse—the notorious duplicity of their neighbours!

3. **εἶχον ἀτρέμας σφέας αὐτοὺς ἵνα ἐτάχθησαν.** These good democrats act as one man, and do not require, apparently, orders, like the Spartans, just up above. Or is the story tender to the fame of Aristeides, the commander-in-chief, and so refrains from directly implicating him? *ἵνα*, *ubi*, cp. Index. The aorist is practically = a pluperfect.

4. **ἐπιστάμενοι τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων φρονήματα.** The participle *ἐπιστάμενοι* is used purely from the Athenian point of view, nor does it necessarily involve more than 'belief,' cp. 8. 132 *supra*. With *φρονήματα* cp. 8. 144, and c. 7 *supra*. It would be unfair to Hdt. to cite him as endorsing or accepting even, as his own, the utterance of Athenian prejudice which follows: to wit, that Lakedaimonians were men who thought one thing and said another, men whose words, agreements, promises, pledges, could not be relied on as representing their intentions, much less their conduct, when the time for action arrived.

Lakedaimonian perfidy was a popular topic at Athens: Aristophanes (who had another axe to grind) satirizes the commonplace, cp. *Acharn.* 300 ff., *Peace* 1063 ff. Blakesley compared the Roman view of *Punica fides* and continental opinion of 'perfidious Albion': one might perhaps add Albion's opinion of certain continental states. Rawlinson more innocently observed that the soreness caused by recent disappointment (in 479 B.C.) might have produced, at Athens, a distrust of the Spartans. Stein's observation that Hdt. in this passage stands *ganz auf athenischer Seite* is more to the point, but hardly carries us quite far enough. Hdt. himself is probably as innocent as Rawlinson in the matter; but if the Athenian story goes out of its way to charge the Spartans

καὶ ἄλλα λεγόντων. ὡς δὲ ἐκινήθη τὸ στρατόπεδον, ἔπεμπον σφέων ἱππέα ὀψόμενόν τε εἰ πορεύεσθαι ἐπιχειρέοιεν οἱ Σπαρτιῆται, εἴτε καὶ τὸ παράπαν μὴ διανοεῦνται ἀπαλλάσσε-
55 σθαι, ἐπειρέσθαι τε Παυσανίην τὸ χρεὸν εἴη ποιέειν. ὡς δὲ ἀπίκετο ὁ κῆρυξ ἐς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, ὥρα τε σφέας κατὰ χώρην τεταγμένους καὶ ἐς νείκεα ἀπιγμένους αὐτῶν τοὺς

5 δ' **a** 6 ἐπιχειροῖεν **a**, Holder 7 τοπαράπαν Pz 8 χρεὼν CPz, van H. **55.** 2 τε σφέας R : τέ σφεας 3 αὐτέων z

with duplicity, it is because the Athenian source has some perfidy, or incompetence, or failure on the Athenian side to excuse or to disguise.

5. **ὡς δὲ ἐκινήθη τὸ στρατόπεδον** refers back to *ὡς ἐκινήθησαν* in c. 52 *supra*. The movement of the centre had, of course, for the time being, placed the Athenians in isolation on the left wing.

6. **ἱππέα.** The Athenians had no proper cavalry at this time (cp. c. 21 l. 15 *supra*), but they may have had mounted *aides-de-camp* or *κήρυκες*. The Spartan commander has apparently a mounted *aide-de-camp* too; c. 60 *infra*. The double construction **ἔπεμπον ὀψόμενον** and (*ἔπεμπον*) **ἐπειρέσθαι** is noticeable: *ἐπειρέσθαι* apparently refers to one only of the two alternatives covered by *ὀψόμενον*, so that *ἐπειρησόμενον* would have conveyed a different and inappropriate sense. The temptation is strong to read *εἴ τε* for *τε εἰ*, as that would soften the strict co-ordination between participle and verb; cp. a somewhat similar case c. 6 *supra*. The variation **εἰ πορεύεσθαι ἐπιχειρέοιεν** (opt. for the less probable alternative) and **εἴ** (**τε**) . . **μὴ διανοεῦνται ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι** (for the move to be expected) is observable; cp. 8. 106 *ὅσα . . ἔχοι . . ὅσα ποιήσει*). The second construction is, of course, different from the *εἰ μὴ ἀμυνεῦσι* of the partially parallel passage in c. 6 *supra*.

8. **ἐπειρέσθαι τε κτλ.**: and in that case 'to ask Pausanias what they ought to do'—on the whole, these good Athenians are still ready to take their directions from the commander-in-chief; cp. c. 27 *supra ad f. ἐξηγέεσθε ὡς πεισομένων*. They cannot trust the Spartan's word, but they are ready to obey the Spartan's orders! It is as though, in some way or other, the Spartans would take a mean advantage of the Athenians, in getting these to go, while they themselves remained at their post! That is an idea belonging to the Athenian theory of the Persian war, which represented it as a race between Athens and Sparta, which should first crush out the invader—a race in which Marathon for ever secured the prize of valour for Athens! (Cp. Hdt. IV.-VI. vol. ii. p. 194.)

Perhaps this (mounted man) episode is only a reply to, or refutation of, the (Spartan) assertion that in the stress of battle the Spartans had sent to ask for assistance, which the Athenians failed to render, c. 60 *infra*. If there is any truth in it, that truth may underlie the question *τὸ χρεὸν εἴη ποιέειν*, 'what are we to do?' The Athenians were in difficulties, but not on account of the retreat of the centre, if it be true that a general retreat had been agreed on, and ordered; for they could not yet know that the centre had not retreated but fled (even if that was true!). But in what difficulties were the Athenians? Perhaps the message was to the effect that the centre was retreating so slowly that the Athenians had not yet been able to start, and to request Pausanias to hurry the centre's movements. Cp. l. 14.

55. 2. **ὥρα τε**: the *τε* is not in its logical place (*τεταγμένους τε*), unless it were meant to suggest a *zeugma*, *καὶ* (*ἤκουε*), or such. The herald (*κῆρυξ* = *ἱππεύς*) 'saw,' or found them, *κατὰ χώρην*, cp. 8. 73, 108. The Spartans were in proper array (**τεταγμένους**). It was, of course, still night. He saw, or heard, the first men among them openly quarrelling. **τοὺς πρώτους**, not apparently first in order of march, but first in order of rank; not, however, referring to 'Euryanax and Pausanias,' who appear to be on one side, but to them on the one part and Amompharetos on the other.

πρώτους. ὡς γὰρ δὴ παρηγορέοντο τὸν Ἀμομφάρετον ὅ τε Εὐρυάναξ καὶ ὁ Παυσανίης μὴ κινδυνεύειν μένοντας μούνους Λακεδαιμονίων, οὔ κως ἔπειθον, ἐς ὃ ἐς νεικεά τε συμπεσόντες ἀπίκατο καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ τῶν Ἀθηναίων παρίστατό σφι ἀπιγμένος. νεικέων δὲ ὁ Ἀμομφάρετος λαμβάνει πέτρον ἀμφοτέρῃσι τῇσι χερσὶ καὶ τιθεὶς πρὸ ποδῶν τῶν Παυσανίεω ταύτῃ τῇ ψήφῳ ψηφίζεσθαι ἔφη μὴ φεύγειν τοὺς ξείνους, λέγων τοὺς βαρβάρους. ὁ δὲ μαινόμενον καὶ οὐ φρενήρεα καλέων ἐκεῖνον, πρός τε τὸν Ἀθηναίων κήρυκα ἐπειρωτῶντα τὰ ἐντεταλμένα λέγειν ὁ Παυσανίης ἐκέλευε τὰ παρεόντα σφι πρήγματα, ἐχρήιζέ τε τῶν Ἀθηναίων προσχωρῆσαί τε πρὸς ἑωυτοὺς καὶ

4 *παρηγόρεον* **β**Pz, Holder 5 *καὶ* om. C 6 *Λακεδαιμονίων* Paris. fr., Schaefer, Wesseling, Gaisford, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *Λακεδαιμονίους* || *οὔκων*? Stein[1]: *οὔκουν* Paris. fr. 7 *ἀπικέατο* Pz || *ὁ* om. Marc. 9 *τῶν*: *τὸν* B: *τοῦ* Paris. fr. 10 *λέγων*: *ξείνους λέγων* **β**, Holder: *ξείνους λέγων τοὺς βαρβάρους* del. Werfer, Naber, van H.: aut *ξείνους* legendum aut *λέγων τοὺς βαρβάρους* tollenda censeo 11 *μαινόμενόν* <*τε*> van H. || *οὐ*: *ὡς* B: om. Marc. || *καλέων* . . *ἐπειρωτῶντα* om. R 12 *πρός τε* del. Krueger, van H.: *τραπόμενός τε πρὸς* coni. Stein[2] || *τὸν*: *τῶν* S || *ἀθηναῖον* **α** || *κήρυκα τραπόμενος* coni. Stein[1] || *ἐπειρωτῶντα* codd. (*ἐπηρωτῶντα* C), Stein[2], Holder: *ἐπειρωτέοντα* Stein[1], van H. 13 *ὁ Παυσανίης* del. Krueger, van H. 14 *ἔχρηζέ* RSMarc. *z*: *ἔχρηξε* V || *τε* om. **β** || *καὶ ποιέειν* . . *ἑωυτοὺς* om. R

4. **παρηγορέοντο**: in the previous chapter the same word is used in the active; the imperfect remains in full force. A further variation is obtained by the substitution of **μούνους** ('he and his men') for *μοῦνον* there.

6. **ἐς νεικεά τε συμπεσόντες ἀπίκατο καὶ . . παρίστατό σφι ἀπιγμένος.** There is here (*a*) a simple and obvious parataxis; cp. c. 47 *supra*. (*b*) But why *συμπεσόντες* and *ἀπιγμένος*? Why not *ἐς νεικεά τε ἀπίκατο* (cp. *ἐς νεικεα ἀπιγμένους* just above) *καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ ἀπῖκτο*, or *ἀπιγμένος ἦν*, or *ἐστί*, or even *ἀπίκετο*? Well, there are limits to the baldness of phraseology tolerable to Hdt., though he is not over-careful to avoid verbal repetitions and clash. (*c*) But *συμπεσόντες* with *ἀπίκατο* seems *de trop*; the phrase here is *ἐς νείκεα ἀπίκατο* (cp. *ἐς ν. ἀπιγμένους*). In 3. 120 *ἐκ λόγων ἐς νείκεα συμπεσεῖν* is not 'from words to come to blows,' but 'to fall a-quarrelling in the course of conversation.' Here too *συνέπεσον* without *ἀπίκατο* would have done. The participle here is used (I cannot but think) with a confused sense of anticipating the 'coincidence,' the 'synchronism,' recorded in the bare parataxis. Hdt. is not invariably lucid in point of expression; cp. c. 51 *supra*, 7. 152 (confusion in *οἰκήια κακά*).

8. **πέτρον . . ψήφῳ**: in marked contrast: 'boulder,' and 'pebble.'

11. **ὃ δέ κτλ.** The agitation of the scene seems to communicate itself to the narrative of the historian. **ὁ** is, of course, Pausanias; **ἐκεῖνον** is Amompharetos. The **τε** in *πρός τε* is perhaps merely displaced, and co-ordinates the sentence *ἐκέλευε τά κτλ.* with *ἐχρήιζέ τε κτλ.* The displacement has led to a reintroduction of the subject *ὁ Παυσανίης*.

οὐ φρενήρεα: *non compotem sui*; cp. 3. 25.

12. **τὰ ἐντεταλμένα**: sc. *τί χρεόν ἐστι ποιέειν; τί ἡμῖν ποιητέον;* c. 54 *ad f.*

13. **τὰ παρεόντα σφι πρήγματα,** 'the business (trouble) on which they were engaged,' or 'in which they were involved.'

14. **προσχωρῆσαί τε πρὸς ἑωυτοὺς καὶ ποιέειν περὶ τῆς ἀπόδου τά περ ἂν καὶ σφεῖς.** So far as this request in-

56 ποιέειν περὶ τῆς ἀπόδου τά περ ἂν καὶ σφεῖς. καὶ ὃ μὲν ἀπαλλάσσετο ἐς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους· τοὺς δὲ ἐπεὶ ἀνακρινομένους πρὸς ἑωυτοὺς ἠὼς κατελάμβανε, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ κατήμενος ὁ Παυσανίης, οὐ δοκέων τὸν Ἀμομφάρετον λείψεσθαι τῶν ἄλλων Λακεδαιμονίων ἀποστειχόντων, τὰ δὴ καὶ ἐγένετο, σημήνας ἀπῆγε διὰ τῶν κολωνῶν τοὺς λοιποὺς πάντας· εἵποντο δὲ καὶ Τεγεῆται. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ταχθέντες ἤισαν τὰ

56. 2 [ἀνα]κρινομένους van H. 5 ἀποστιχόντων **aB** || καὶ om. **B** 6 κωλῶν S 7 ἤισαν AB : ἦσαν C : om. Marc.

volves any modification of the original decision of the Council of War to retire, c. 51 *supra*, the modification may simply amount to this, that, whereas by the original plan the two wings were to concentrate independently on the Island, by this modification they were to effect an earlier junction, the delay in the movement of the centre having altered the conditions unfavourably. But this interpretation is not inevitable. The formula above may simply represent the original plan for concentration back on to the Island by the two wings. If that plan had broken down now, its collapse may have been due, not to the insubordinate obstinacy of Amompharetos (which Athenians might regard as heroic) nor to the 'flight' of the centre, but to the failure of the Athenians to start soon enough, perhaps because prematurely engaged on the left. *περ*, 'exactly'; *ἑωυτούς* perhaps because 'Euryanax and Pausanias' have been mentioned; or else = *Σπαρτιήτας*, and to avoid *σφέας* with *σφεῖς* immediately following. Its use is quite in keeping with this *oratio non nihil turbata* (Baehr).

56. 2. **τοὺς δὲ . . ἠὼς κατελάμβανε**: the dawn of the 13th, cp. c. 52 *supra*; the very day of battle, or of the supreme battle. **ἀνακρινομένους**, 'quarrelling'; the verb is apparently used with this meaning only in this one passage; the subst. *ἀνάκρισις* in 8. 69 may be compared though used in a different sense; but cp. App. Crit. **ἑωυτούς** here seems = *ἀλλήλους*.

3. **ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ** might better be taken of the point of dawn than of the much enduring night, now over.

κατήμενος: perhaps not literally 'sitting,' cp. c. 72 *infra*, but 'without moving.'

4. **οὐ δοκέων . . λείψεσθαι**: nothing has been recorded in the story previously to justify this belief that Amompharetos will not remain behind.

5. **ἀποστειχόντων** is a rather grand and poetical word; the simple verb is never used in prose.

6. **σημήνας**: sc. *τῇ σάλπιγγι*, cp. 8. 11 (c. 42 *supra*, the case is not so clear). The operations at night had doubtless been carried out with all possible silence and secrecy; but it was now daylight, and the movement of the Greek forces no doubt observed; there could be no reason for not employing the usual signals.

ἀπῆγε διὰ τῶν κολωνῶν: the statement is precise to the effect that Pausanias was retiring; what are the *κολωνοί* in question? Presumably the ridges descending from Kithairon, as is more fully indicated in the next chapter. Unfortunately Hdt. does not specify the point of the compass towards which Pausanias was moving.

7. **εἵποντο**: as the Tegeatai had been standing to the west of the Spartans, if they really 'followed' them now, the Spartans would have moved first, and presumably in an easterly direction (however otherwise qualified); but it is possible that *εἵποντο* is not to be pressed, and that the Spartans really bring up the rear. The action of Amompharetos looks like that. If so, the retreat was probably in a SW. direction. But see further, below.

Ἀθηναῖοι δέ κτλ. Neither is the movement and direction of the Athenians indicated or described so precisely as could be wished.

ταχθέντες points to the movement being in accordance with orders, presumably the orders of Pausanias; *τεταγμένοι* would signify that they were in actual battle-array (as no doubt they were). Stein cps. c. 104 *infra*, and 7. 121, 169, 8. 7, 13.

ἤισαν τὰ ἔμπαλιν ἢ Λακεδαιμόνιοι. In 7. 58 the king's fleet goes from Abydos *τὰ ἔμπαλιν πρήσσων τοῦ πεζοῦ*

ἔμπαλιν ἢ Λακεδαιμόνιοι· οἱ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τε ὄχθων ἀντείχοντο καὶ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος φοβεόμενοι τὴν ἵππον, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ κάτω τραφθέντες ἐς τὸ πεδίον. Ἀμομφάρετος δὲ **57**

9 *ὑπωρείης* libri 10 *τραφέντες* **B** : *στραφθέντες* C

(i.e. *ἢ ὁ πεζός*), which Hdt. explains as meaning in that case that the fleet was going west while the army was going east; i.e. he does not there mean that the fleet went on water while the army went on land; the point of difference is purely one of direction, of orientation. Yet in the present passage Stein maintains that *τὰ ἔμπαλιν* denotes not a difference of direction, but simply and solely the difference of the surface over which the two bodies were moving; this appears an improbable and inadequate explanation, not in accordance with the meaning of *ἔμπαλιν*, with the other clear instance in Hdt., or finally, with the context here. For here Hdt. says not merely that the Spartans were moving **διὰ τῶν κολωνῶν** (*τῶν τε ὄχθων καὶ τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος ἀντεχόμενοι*) and the Athenians **ἐς τὸ πεδίον** (not by the way *διὰ τοῦ πεδίου*, or *κατὰ τὸ πεδίον*); he also expressly describes the Athenians as **τραφθέντες** or *κάτω τραφθέντες* (sc. *ἤισαν ἐς τὸ πεδίον*).

There has, therefore, been a turn, a wheel, in the line, in the orientation of the Athenians. Whether there has also been a turn in the orientation of the Lakedaimonians Hdt. does not say. What amount of wheel would constitute or justify the use of *τὰ ἔμπαλιν* may be a question; the words obviously might be used of a movement, or double movement, much short of being in contrary directions. In the present case Hdt. need not mean that Athenians and Spartans were moving in diametrically opposite directions, starting, as it were, back to back; he may mean no more than that 'they were moving in anything but the same direction.' Whether he is right or not is a widely different question. If Spartans and Athenians were under orders to fill up the gap and concentrate, while at the same time retiring, 'on the Island,' that movement might have been effected by the wings falling back, *Lochos* by *Lochos*, from the east and the west ends of the previous line to a common point south, or south-west, of the position at starting; and even such a manœuvre, with reference to the *termini a quibus*, might be described as movements *τὰ ἔμπαλιν*. But the movement here predicated of the Athenians may go far beyond this. By *τὸ πεδίον* might be understood not merely the trough of Gargaphia and A[1], but the more genuine plain north of Plataia. If so, the movement of the Athenians was westward, more or less by south, and its object may have been to balk the approach of the medizing Greeks on the Persian right, with whom the Athenians are presently engaged. Had the Greeks previously been in a hollow square, or with a *φάλαγξ ἀμφίστομος* round the church of St. John (Androkrateion), then the Athenians, to the north, might have wheeled round, till they were facing west, or even south-west, while the Spartans may have either remained, facing south (by west) as they had been all the previous day, or may even have turned, have been obliged to turn, until they were facing east, or north-east.

8. **τῶν τε ὄχθων ἀντείχοντο.** It is not by any means self-evident what actual ground is here denoted by the *ὄχθοι*, cp. 8. 52, 4. 203 (not *ὄχθαι*, 'river-banks'), to which the Lakedaimonians were 'holding on,' clinging, keeping close, or anxious to do so: are they identical with *τῆς ὑπωρέης τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος*? Are the Spartans already thereon, and wishing to stay thereon, or are they striving to get thereonto? Are the *ὄχθοι* generally the ridges running down from Kithairon to the Asopos, as distinguished from *τὸ πεδίον*? Or are they the ridges north of the trough in which Gargaphia was situate?—in fact, the 'Asopos Ridge' and 'Long Ridge' of Dr. Grundy's map?

9. **φοβεόμενοι τὴν ἵππον**: the Lakedaimonians are 'afraid of the cavalry' according to this story, and that is given as the reason for their line of retreat: a genuinely Attic touch. Oddly enough, when it comes to action, the Lakedaimonians, who are on more or less high ground, are apparently assaulted by the cavalry, while the Athenians are not expressly recorded to have encountered any cavalry below! (cp. c. 67 *infra*).

ἀρχήν γε οὐδαμὰ δοκέων Πανσανίην τολμήσειν σφέας ἀπολιπεῖν, περιείχετο αὐτοῦ μένοντας μὴ ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν τάξιν· προτερεόντων δὲ τῶν σὺν Πανσανίῃ, καταδόξας αὐτοὺς ἰθέῃ τέχνῃ ἀπολείπειν αὐτόν, ἀναλαβόντα τὸν λόχον τὰ ὅπλα ἦγε βάδην πρὸς τὸ ἄλλο στῖφος· τὸ δὲ ἀπελθὸν ὅσον τε δέκα στάδια ἀνέμενε τὸν Ἀμομφαρέτου λόχον, περὶ ποταμὸν Μολόεντα

---

57. 2 *γε* Schweighaeuser, Stein, van H.: *τε* (del. Krueger) 4 *καταδόξαντες* **B**: *κάρτα δόξας* Marc. || *θείῃ* **B**: *ἰθείῃι* ceteri: *ἰθέῃ μὴ τέχνῃ* coni. Madvig, adm. Holder 5 *ἀπολιπεῖν* **B**P || *τὸν λόχον* om. *z* 6 *ἄλλο* om. **B** || *στίφος* CR 7 *παρὰ* Marc. || *μοόεντα* **B**: *μελόεντα* Marc.

---

57. 2. **ἀρχήν γε οὐδαμὰ δοκέων**, 'originally at least never dreaming (that Pausanias would go so far as to abandon them).' *ἀρχήν*, 7. 220, 8. 128. *οὐδαμά* might more logically have gone with *τολμήσειν*. The *γε* serves here in contrast to *προτερεόντων δέ*: but cp. App. Crit.

3. **περιείχετο . . μὴ ἐκλιπεῖν**: the construction is peculiar, as *περιέχεσθαι* (*mid.*) naturally takes a genitive, even as *ἀντέχεσθαι* just above; cp. 7. 39, 160; 8. 60. **αὐτοῦ** is of course a local adverb, 'on the spot.' *περιέχεσθαι* as a passive, and in a strictly physical sense in 8. 10, 79, 80 *supra*, here is plainly middle, but is it purely psychological in sense? cp. the various renderings: (*a*) "*he was urgent with them that* they should stay and not leave him," L. & S.; "*he stuck to it that* they should stay there and not leave their post," Macaulay; "*setzte sich darauf dass sie* (alle)," Krueger; "*beharrte darauf* hier zu bleiben," Baehr; (*b*) "remained firm in his resolve," Rawlinson; "*hielt sich an den Gedanken, dass sie*," Sitzler. As the statement is qualified by *ἀρχήν*, and the mentality of Amompharetos is set forth in *δοκέων*, and his contrasted action is purely physical (*ἦγε*), I do not hesitate to take *περιείχετο* as belonging to the external order and descriptive of the action, i.e. utterance of the man: 'he kept on insisting that they should stay where they were, and not desert their post,' as in the (*a*) group (but L. & S. give rather a paraphrase than a translation).

4. **προτερεόντων δὲ τῶν σὺν Πανσανίῃ**, 'as Pausanias and his men were getting further and further off . ., convinced (**καταδόξας**) that they were really abandoning him, he led his *Lochos*, after the men had taken up their shields, at a slow step towards the main body.' *προτερέειν*, cp. c. 66 *infra*; *καταδόξας*, cp. 8. 69.

ἰθέῃ τέχνῃ: cp. c. 37 *supra*.

5. **αὐτόν** is remarkable: it is generally referred to the man = *ἑωυτόν*; it might more correctly refer to *τὸν λόχον*. Krueger renders it "ihn und seinen Lochos."

6. **βάδην**, contrasted with *δρόμῳ*; cp. c. 59 *infra*, Xenophon *Anab.* 4. 6. 25, *Hell.* 5. 4. 53.

στῖφος: cp. c. 70 *infra*. This 'main body' is awaiting 'the *Lochos* of Amompharetos' (*sic*) at a distance of 10 stades; i.e. exactly the distance given above, c. 51, as the distance separating the Island, to which the Council of War had agreed and determined to retreat, from the position of the Greek forces at Gargaphia; yet the Lakedaimonians are not at the Island, as the next words go on to say!

7. **περὶ ποταμὸν Μολόεντα.** There is no third river, beside the Asopos with its tributaries, and the Oëroë with its tributaries, to which the name *Μολόεις* can be applied: it follows that the name must be applied to some stream belonging to one or other of the two systems. No ancient authority clearly indicates the right identification; modern travellers and commentators are divided on the subject. Thus the Moloeis has been identified with O[1] (so by Vischer, p. 547, cp. Bursian, *Geogr. v. Griechenl.* i. 247), while Dr. Grundy, who adopted A[5] in his *Topography of the Battle of Plataia*, 1894, p. 33, in his *Great Persian War*, 1901, p. 495, now prefers A[6]. These (O[1], A[6]) are respectively the two most considerable affluents, the one of Oëroë, the other of Asopos; *Ridge 2*, forming the watershed east and west, lies between them. Thus, as far as the R. Moloeis

ἱδρυμένον Ἀργιόπιόν τε χῶρον καλεόμενον, τῇ καὶ Δήμητρος

8 ἀργιόπτόν Marc.

goes, the geographical indication comes to much the same thing, and might point to Ridge 2 as the halting-place of Pausanias.

8. **Ἀργιόπιόν τε χῶρον καλεόμενον.** The Ἀργιόπιος χῶρος, possibly τὸ Ἀργιόπιον, is not elsewhere mentioned. A nymph Argiope is known to Pausanias (4. 33. 3), but she belongs to Parnassos, not to Kithairon: more in place here were Argiope, wife of Agenor, and mother of Kadmos; Pherekydes, *Frag.* 40. She is a water-nymph, for she is a daughter of Neilos: her name should perhaps be Ἀγριόπη rather than Ἀργιόπη. (Cp. Hyginus, *Fab.* vi. ed. Th. Muncker, 1681.) In any case, the Argiopion rather leans towards Oëroë. The attempt to connect the 'place' with a 'White Rock' (W. Irving Hunt, *Papers of Am. Sch. at Athens*, v. 1892, p. 276) is not satisfactory; cp. Grundy, p. 495; nor need Pape now be cited as authority for that etymological effort. Dr. Grundy was divided (in 1894) between 'Long Ridge' and 'Plateau'; he has now decided for the latter. But Ridge 2, the watershed between Oëroë and his own Moloeis, has clearly as good a right as either.

Δήμητρος Ἐλευσινίης ἱρόν. One of the indications, which make it difficult to believe that Hdt. had been over the ground, is the fact that there were at least two temples of Eleusinian Demeter within the area of the operations he is describing, viz. (1) at Plataia, Pausanias 9. 4. 2; (2) at Hysiai, Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 11. To these Dr. Grundy adds (3) one at Erythrai, on the strength of the discovery of inscribed stones on the traditional site of Erythrai, *Topography* (1894), p. 34. (The ναός at Skolos, Pausan. 9. 4. 3, and the ἄλσος at Potniai, Pausan. 9. 9. 1, which would raise the *Demetria* to five in number, may be ignored for present purposes.) Of these three temples, the Plataian, if it were inside the city, on no possible theory of the battle could be employed to define the position of the Spartans; nor would a site in Plataia in any sense accord with the other indications so far as they have been provisionally identified above, viz. the river Moloeis and the Argiopion, or Ἀργιόπιος χῶρος. But if it were outside the city, though in Plataian territory, the case would be altered. See further, below.

The third, the Erythraian *Demetrion*, was located high up the ὑπωρέη, considerably more than 10 stades from either Gargaphia, and, what is still more against it, would indicate that the Spartans were making back to Erythrai, and to the first position (I[A]), from which they had advanced originally, and where the Greeks had been especially open to attack from the Persian cavalry, and also in want of water. These considerations rule out the Erythraian shrine in this place.

There remains the Hysiatan, which, from the position of Hysiai and its territory, would necessarily in some sense lie between the Demetrion of Plataia west, and that of Erythrai east. Such a position obviously suits the general requirements of the story, as well as the provisional identifications of the Argiopion and the river Moloeis above. The question remains of the exact site of the Hysiatan Demetrion. Was it actually in the town of Hysiai, i.e. high up on the ὑπωρέη, in front of the middle pass, on the road from Plataia to Athens, where it entered the mountain; or was it lower down the slopes, in Hysiatan territory?

Plutarch, *Arist.* 11, describes it as τῶν Ὑσιῶν πλησίον, ὑπὸ τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα. It was near Hysiai, therefore, not inside Hysiai; it was 'close under Kithairon'—a description which might be applied to any spot south of Asopos, especially by a visitor coming from the north (Thebes or Chaironeia). It is not probable that there were two temples of Eleusinian Demeter in the Hysiatis. If then, as Dr. Grundy has ingeniously suggested (*Topography*, p. 33; *Persian War*, pp. 495 f.), the modern church of St. Demetrion marks the site of an ancient temple of Demeter, that would be the Hysiatan Demetrion, outside and to the north below the city.

But this identification will not suit at all either Plutarch or Herodotus. In Plutarch the Demetrion marks the position near Hysiai to which the Athenians advanced in the first instance, a position high up on the ὑπωρέη and

Ἐλευσινίης ἱρὸν ἧσται. ἀνέμενε δὲ τοῦδε εἵνεκα, ἵνα ἢν μὴ ἀπολείπῃ τὸν χῶρον ἐν τῷ ἐτετάχατο ὁ Ἀμομφάρετός τε καὶ ὁ λόχος, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ μένωσι, βοηθέοι ὀπίσω παρ' ἐκείνους. καὶ οἵ τε ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀμομφάρετον παρεγίνοντό σφι καὶ ἡ

9 ἵστα R: ἵσται S (Gaisf.): ἵςαι V: ἐστι coni. Krueger || εἵνεκεν **B** 10 ἀπολείπηι **a**PMarc.: ἀπολίπῃ ceteri, van H. || ὧι **a**CMarc. 11 βοηθέει Marc. 12 παρεγένοντό z

nowhere near the church of St. Demetrion. In Hdt. the Demetrion here marks the position to which the Spartans retreated, 10 stades back, from Gargaphia: that might very well coincide with the original position of the Athenians on the extreme left of the Greek position, which was now become the extreme right of the position; but it is nowhere near the church of St. Demetrion. Thus, if Dr. Grundy is right, Plutarch and Hdt. are wrong in relation to the Demetrion.

Mr. W. Irving Hunt, *op. c.* p. 276, places the Plataian Demetrion "on high ground south-east of Plataia at a point where are now the foundations of a large Byzantine church." He further defines the position as "about six minutes' walk east of the spring Vergoutiani." This position might do for the Plataian Demetrion, but Plutarch professes to be dealing with the Hysiatan; Mr. Hunt has not marked the difference. It appears to me that Dr. Grundy has really hit upon the position of the Hysiatan Eleusinion; but that it was the Plataian Eleusinion (if Mr. Hunt is right in regard to its site), of which Plutarch ought to have spoken in that passage, and Hdt. in this. It is quite obvious that if the church of St. Demetrion marks the site of the Hysiatan Demetrion, that site, and that edifice, can have nothing to say to the former position of the Athenians (Plutarch) nor to the latter position of the Lakedaimonians (Hdt.). The wonder recorded by Hdt., c. 62 below, if occurring in the Persian rout, however, might suit with the site of the church. The cause of all the confusion is Hdt.'s ignorance that there could be more than one Demetrion in question. By a somewhat unusual infelicity Hdt. here applies **ἱδρυμένον** to the army (*στῖφος*) and uses the term **ἧσται** of the temple (*ἱρόν*). *ἡμένον*, or *κατημένον* of the army, *ἵδρυσται* of the temple, would have been more natural. Buttmann (*ap.* Baehr) even said that *ἧσθαι* for *ἵδρυσθαι* was inadmissible: cp. c. 51 *supra* (*περισχίζεται ῥέουσα*). (If *ἱδρυμένον* was to be used of the man, and *ἡμένον* of the temple, Amompharetos, rather than Pausanias, would seem to be the proper man. As far as the word goes it might here agree, not with *τό* (sc. *τὸ ἄλλο στῖφος*) but with *τὸν Ἀμομφαρέτου λόχον*, in which case it would be easier to identify the Demetrion with the church of Demetrion. But the argument demands that Pausanias' position should be the one described; the position of Amompharetos is *ex hypothesi* near Gargaphia, and this would be a curiously late point at which to be describing it; cp. c. 53 *supra*.)

9. **ἀνέμενε δὲ τοῦδε εἵνεκα**: the fact that he waited for Amompharetos, or at any rate halted and was afterwards joined by Amompharetos, is much more likely to be true (in accordance with a constant canon of Herodotean criticism) than the reason given for the fact, the motivation. The statement here made that, if only Amompharetos had carried his obstinate insubordination a little further, Pausanias would have yielded and returned to support him, is very little short of absurd. The obvious hypothesis is that Amompharetos, like every other good Spartan, was strictly obeying orders; that his *λόχος* was the last to move because such was his commander's will; that it was really told off to cover the movement backwards. The words **ἐν τῷ ἐτετάχατο ὁ Ἀμ. τε καὶ ὁ λόχος** unconsciously support that view, but Hdt. unfortunately does not further define this *χῶρος* (unless *ἱδρυμένον* above be taken to agree with *λόχον*).

12. **οἵ τε ἀμφὶ . . καὶ ἡ ἵππος**: a parataxis. Amompharetos and his men joined them just as the whole Persian cavalry attacked them. This statement is somewhat puzzling. The Spartans have retired from their previous position 10 stades backwards, to avoid the cavalry (*φοβεόμενοι τὴν ἵππον*) and on to

ἵππος ἡ τῶν βαρβάρων προσέκειτο πᾶσα. οἱ γὰρ ἱππόται ἐποίευν οἷον καὶ ἐώθεσαν ποιέειν αἰεί, ἰδόντες δὲ τὸν χῶρον κεινὸν ἐν τῷ ἐτετάχατο οἱ Ἕλληνες τῇσι προτέρῃσι ἡμέρῃσι, ἤλαυνον τοὺς ἵππους αἰεὶ τὸ πρόσω καὶ ἅμα καταλαβόντες προσεκέατό σφι.

58 Μαρδόνιος δὲ ὡς ἐπύθετο τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀποιχομένους ὑπὸ νύκτα εἶδέ τε τὸν χῶρον ἔρημον, καλέσας τὸν Ληρισαῖον Θώρηκα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφεοὺς αὐτοῦ Εὐρύπυλον καὶ Θρασυδήιον ἔλεγε "ὦ παῖδες Ἀλεύεω, ἔτι τί λέξετε τάδε ὁρῶντες ἔρημα; ὑμεῖς γὰρ οἱ πλησιόχωροι ἐλέγετε Λακεδαιμονίους οὐ φεύγειν

14 *εἰώθεσαν* S || *ἀεὶ* **a**, Holder || *δὲ* del. Krueger 15 *ἐκεῖνον* Marc. *z* || *ᾧ* CPMarc. *z* 16 *ἀεὶ* **a**, Holder **58.** 2 *τε* om. **B** || *ληρισσαῖον* **B** 3 *θρασυδαῖον* **B** : *θρασύδηον* Marc. : *Θρασύδιον* *z* 4 *ἀλευέτω* B || *ἔτι τι* Krueger : *τί ἔτι* van H. : *τί* om. CMarc. || *ὁρέοντες* Marc. *z*, Stein[1], van H. : *ὁρέωντες* C || *ἐρῆμα* CPMarc. *z* 5 *λέγετε* CP*z*

.igher ground. How can the whole avalry be attacking them? The vague- ıess of the statement is further exhibited y what immediately follows. Hdt. ·ys that in thus attacking them the ıvalry was only doing what it had been ːoing all along on the previous days. c. 40 *supra* a similar generalization ·urs; but, if we look for details in ırmation, none is forthcoming. On ntrary, it appears that for upwards week the Greeks had enjoyed ıunity from the cavalry (c. 39 *supra*). vague generalities in c. 40 and here like *a priori* or inferential saving es, while in fact the Greeks in on I[B] had enjoyed immunity from alry, and it was very much that which the Spartans were now ng to regain.

νόν: vacant, vacated.

ἰποιχομένους, 'to be gone have departed; this fact he report, from his scouts, etc. nd then satisfied himself by yes (**εἶδε**) that the position occupied by the Greeks had d. **ἔρημον** = *κεινόν* previous rdonios then proceeded to ı summoning (**καλέσας**) the his side, in order to crow d Artabazos, is a story of .

α, 'under cover of night,' retrospective, cp. 8. 71, . 60 *infra* makes the case

γαῖον Θώρηκα. Thorax of Larisa has appeared, c. 1 *supra*, but without his brothers. He was, doubtless, the most important of the three.

3. **Εὐρύπυλον καὶ Θρασυδήιον.** Eurypylos is an eminently heroic and Homeric name, little used, apparently, in historic times, *Il.* 2. 677 (of Kos); *ib.* 736, cp. Plato, *Rep.* 405D, 408A (of Thessaly); *Od.* 11. 520 (of Mysia), etc. Of this particular one nothing more is narrated. Thrasydaios, on the contrary, is a name not found in legend or saga, but associated with several historic characters: (1) The Theban, in whose honour Pindar composed the obscure Epinikion, *Pyth.* 11 (the theories which date this ode to *Pyth.* 28 = 478 B.C. overlook the improbability of the appearance of a Theban at that celebration). (2) The son and successor of Theron of Akragas, cp. 7. 165 f., Diodor. 11. 48. 6, 53. 1. These two would both have been contemporaries of the Thessalian. (3) Xenoph. *Hell.* 3. 2. 27 ff. mentions an Eleian *προστάτης τοῦ δήμου* of the name (*anno* 400 B.C.). Of the Thessalian in the text nothing more is known.

4. **παῖδες Ἀλεύεω**: cp. 7. 130 = Ἀλευάδαι 7. 6, 172. The name Aleuas is very rare in the historic period, but is found in two Boiotian inscripp., *C.I.G.* 1564, 1580, referring to an Orchomenian.

5. **πλησιόχωροι**: that the speaker should regard the Thessalians and Spartans as 'neighbours' would suggest to a Greek hearer, or reader, the large scale upon which the Persian was wont to think and operate; cp. 3. 89. No

ἐκ μάχης, ἀλλὰ ἄνδρας εἶναι τὰ πολέμια πρώτους· τοὺς πρότερόν τε μετισταμένους ἐκ τῆς τάξιος εἴδετε, νῦν τε ὑπὸ τὴν παροιχομένην νύκτα καὶ οἱ πάντες ὁρῶμεν διαδράντας· διέδεξάν τε, ἐπεί σφεας ἔδεε πρὸς τοὺς ἀψευδέως ἀρίστους ἀνθρώπων μάχῃ διακριθῆναι, ὅτι οὐδένες ἄρα ἐόντες ἐν οὐδαμοῖσι ἐοῦσι Ἕλλησι . . ἐναπεδεικνύατο. καὶ ὑμῖν μὲν ἐοῦσι Περσέων ἀπείροισι πολλὴ ἔκ γε ἐμεῦ ἐγίνετο συγγνώμη,

---

6 ἀλλ' BP 8 ὁρέομεν Pz, Stein[1], van H.: ὁρέωμεν CMarc. || διαδράντες C 11 Ἕλλησι del. Naber, Holder: lacunam ind. Stein[3] 12 γε: τε B

---

statement in regard to Spartan heroism has been recorded of the Aleuads; Mardonios ought to have addressed his remarks to Demaratos (cp. 7. 102, 209, 234); that he does not do so is some evidence that the Spartan exile was not with him. To believe that Mardonios represented the Spartan retirement as a *φυγή* would at once lower our opinion of him as a general.

6. **τὰ πολέμια**: the accusative 'of reference'; cp. Index.

πρώτους: not in time but in rank, quality, etc. Cp. c. 53 *supra*.

7. **μετισταμένους**: the story in cc. 46, 47 *supra*. That movement is nowhere said to have been fully carried out. It was not in fact what Hdt. and his sources supposed; cp. notes *ad ll.*

8. **οἱ πάντες ὁρῶμεν**, 'we all see'; there is a contrast with *εἴδετε* just above; Mardonios himself had not perceived the *μετάταξις*, it had been reported to him, not indeed by the Aleuadai (as might seem to be here implied) but by the Boiotians; cp. c. 47 *supra*. **καὶ διαδράντας**, 'that they have scattered and fled'; cp. 8. 60.

9. **διέδεξαν**: cp. 7. 172; the third **τε** is a climax.

ἔδεε, without any suggestion of the supernatural; cp. 7. 9, 144; contr. 8. 53, and c. 109 *infra*.

10. **ἀνθρώπων**: perhaps without prejudice.

μάχῃ διακριθῆναι: cp. 7. 206. Differently, 7. 219, 8. 18.

οὐδένες ἄρα ἐόντες ἐν οὐδαμοῖσι ἐοῦσι Ἕλλησι . . ἐναπεδεικνύατο: *durius sane dictum ab Herodoto*, Baehr; see below. *οὐδένες* as a normal plural 3. 26 *οὐδένες ἄλλοι οὐδὲν ἔχουσι εἰπεῖν.* For the obvious meaning here Blakesley compares Soph. *Ai.* 1135 *τοὺς μηδένας.* It is even frequent in Euripides, *Androm.* 700, *Ion* 594, *Iph. Aul.* 371 *βαρβάρους τοὺς οὐδένας.* The neuter *τὸ μηδέν* with even more effect for less force, 8. 106.

ἄρα suggests surprise, here a arising from an expectation at las overcome. Cp. Index.

11. **οὐδαμοῖσι**: after *οὐδένες* perhap *οὐδέσι* might have been expected, bu *οὐδαμοί* is the more usual pl. The ch difficulty in the passage lurks in ε *αποδείκνυσθαι*, to which three differen renderings have been given: (*a*) *ostenta* 'to show off,' 'to cut a fine figure,' et merely because the Greeks at large, themselves, were nobodies. Port supplying *ἔργα*, *ἀρετάς*, or *τι*, cp. *infra*; so Stein. If merely *τι* is sup (and the *τι* can be supplied from immediate context below), this w out very nearly as = (*a*); if *ἔργ* makes too much of a concessior either case the omission of the is obscure. (*c*) Taking the meaning simply *monstrare, dem* so Baehr: *commonstrarunt ill vel inter eos, qui nihili sunt nullo loco esse censendos.* T ment, as one degree less ir his Greek allies, whom M addressing, might be pref there is nothing in the C sponding to *vel* which is the rendering. On the wh seems preferable.

12. **ἐοῦσι Περσέων ἀπεί** as absurd and refutable, to the Thessalians, as to themselves, c. 46 *supr* ignoring any previous fig The Thessalians, indeed, against the Persians, but the Persians fight—with

ρους τοῖσί τι καὶ συνηδέατε· Ἀρταβάζου δὲ
ἄλλον ἐποιεύμην τὸ καὶ καταρρωδῆσαι Λακεδαι-
ρωδήσαντά τε ἀποδέξασθαι γνώμην δειλοτάτην,
ἀναζεύξαντας τὸ στρατόπεδον ἰέναι ἐς τὸ Θηβαίων
ισομένους· τὴν ἔτι πρὸς ἐμεῦ βασιλεὺς πεύσεται.
ν ἑτέρωθι ἔσται λόγος· νῦν δὲ ἐκείνοισι ταῦτα
πιτρεπτέα ἐστί, ἀλλὰ διωκτέοι εἰσὶ ἐς ὃ κατα-
σουσι ἡμῖν τῶν δὴ ἐποίησαν Πέρσας πάντων
εἴπας ἦγε τοὺς Πέρσας δρόμῳ διαβάντας τὸν 59

A[2]P ante corr.: συνηιδέαται **a**CPcorr.: συνηδέαται **B**z:
υνηδέετε Schaefer: συνῄδειτε van H. (συνῄδειτε typ.
α **a**CMarc., Stein[2], Holder, van H.: θώϋμα **B**: θῶυμα
, van H. || καταρρωιδῆσαι P 15 καταρρωιδή-
ιeger 16 χρεὸν **aB**, Stein, Holder: χρεὼν 18
οιήσαντο z 59. 1 τὸν om. z

the sequence
ct; cp. c.
on is not
σί τι καὶ
ourselves.'
ermopylai,

mitive may
ταρρωδῆσαι,
the subst.
the accus.
as a gram-
e full report
bazos, already
akes its repetition
e more remarkable,
re is here a direct
ἐποιεύμην imperf.) to
πολιορκησομένους here
it than the former report,
stitution of ἄστυ for πόλιν
he project all the more.
ἔτι πρὸς ἐμεῦ βασιλεὺς πεύ-
σεται. the irony of this promise, or
prediction, in the story is keen; what
actually happened was that Artabazos
reported to the king the folly and the
fate of Mardonios. The same tone is
maintained in the next sentence: **καὶ τούτων μὲν ἑτέρωθι ἔσται λόγος**, i.e. of all that, account shall be taken when I go home. **λόγος**, ratio rather than *oratio*. There is a slight logical confusion in the use of **μέν** and **δέ** in this connexion. The contrast is between ἑτέρωθι and νῦν, not between τούτων and νῦν or even ἐκείνοισι. If that natural antithesis had been observed, it would have been more logical to contrast νῦν μέν with ἑτέρωθι δὲ . .

19. **ποιεῦσι** is strictly present, or imperf., 'engaged in performing . .'

ἐπιτρεπτέα does not agree with ταῦτα (acc.), and the singular might be clearer. Is the plural used to emphasize the divisions of the Hellenes (διαδράντας *supra*)?

καταλαμφθέντες: the normal Herodotean form; cp. 5. 21.

20. **δώσουσι . . δίκας** is hardly consistent with their having done nothing! And **δή** emphasizes their malefactions! The reference is certainly not to 7. 134 ff. but rather to Thermopylai, and ironically to the story 8. 114, and is thus altogether inconsistent with the contempt for the Spartans expressed just above.

59. 1. **ἦγε τοὺς Πέρσας.** Here, if anywhere, the battle begins; but the cavalry have, according to c. 57 *supra*, already opened the ball. Mardonios himself is mounted, cp. c. 63 *infra*, but he is evidently leading infantry. 'Persians' here used specifically, as distinguished from the rest of the barbarians; cp. just below, and cc. 31, 47 *supra*.

δρόμῳ, 'at the double'; cp. c. 57 *supra* βάδην, and especially 6. 112.

διαβάντας τὸν Ἀσωπόν, 'after they (had) crossed the Asopos'—words which show clearly (if anything in a narrative by Hdt. can be really conclusive), that the Persians had been beyond the Asopos, the river between them and the Greeks, so far as the

Ἀσωπὸν κατὰ στίβον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὡς δὴ
ἐπεῖχέ τε ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους τε καὶ Τεγεήτας μ
ναίους γὰρ τραπομένους ἐς τὸ πεδίον ὑπὸ τ

2 *τῶν* : *τὸν* ? Kallenberg

main positions, and the *στρατόπεδα*, the armies at rest, were concerned.

How the Persians got across the Asopos Hdt. does not specify; it cannot have been all boarded over; there may have been some bridges, or planks, in use; but for all that appears they scrambled across as best they could. The passage of the Asopos, which they had steadily declined, so long as the Greeks were in battle-array on the other side, is now undertaken apparently under the idea that the Greeks are in full retreat, perhaps for their several homes; the extreme left wing is invisible to Mardonios. He may even believe that it has made good its escape; at least he may safely leave it to the tender mercies of the Thebans and his own right. He sights easily enough the glint of Greek weapons at the Heraion, and up beyond, in the gap of the road to Megara, in the gap of the road to Athens; while in the nearer foreground are the Spartans, with their commander, apparently in full retreat, and isolated from the other Greek divisions. His cavalry is riding unopposed up the road to Erythrai, as it has been free to do ever since the Greek deployed from that position.

2. **κατὰ στίβον**: cp. 4. 122, 140, 5. 102. Not to be taken here as implying that the Lakedaimonians were invisible to their pursuers; the whole context implies the reverse.

ὡς δὴ ἀποδιδρησκόντων: such was the idea in the minds of the Persians, but it has no justification in fact.

The motivation is here to be accepted not so much on the ground that Greeks in the Persian ranks, or Persian sources themselves, might afterwards have reported Mardonios' motives to that effect; but rather on the ground that to obtain a satisfactory theory of the battle, we must suppose that the object, or a part of the object of the Greeks, in retiring, was to entice Mardonios across the river, in effecting which object the Greek commanders will have given their movement as much as possible the appearance of a 'flight.'

3. **ἐπεῖχέ τε**: cp. *διέδεξάν τε* c. 58.

The verb projecte
appears to be empha
ously taken (*a*) as
attendit, sese direxit
(*b*) as physical, sc. *τ*
Stein; (*c*) intrans.
really = Baehr's *ses*
case Mardonios wit
by the whole m
infantry, made
wing, which was
isolation.

Ἀθηναίους
the *μούνους* jus
of the Athenia
developed th
μένους as a
πεδίον); b
may rath
repeated,
We are t
side, her
by no mea
the Persian
antecedent t
in the descr
the Greeks.

4. **ὑπὸ ... ὤν**
not see the
down on to the
ridges (*ὄχθοι*).
ambiguity here as
the *ὄχθοι* in each ca
not the *ὄχθοι* here th
the river (almost in fa
adduce (with Ross and Ba
ment, perhaps in itself tru
evidence that Hdt. had wi
eyes inspected the battle-field
instance of half-methods. The statement is a clear example of the dialectical production or evolution of tradition. Why did not Mardonios attend to the Athenians? Because he could not see them. Why could he not see them? By reason of the *ὄχθοι*—and so forth. The statement may, of course, have come to Hdt. read made in his source. Though perhaps true, it is not an adequate explanation of the Persian general's action, for he was bound to acquaint himself at once with the proceedings of the Greek left wing; and what were the Aleuadai about to receive

κατώρα. Πέρσας δὲ ὁρῶντες ὁρμημένους διώκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας
οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν βαρβαρικῶν τελέων ἄρχοντες αὐτίκα πάντες
ἤειραν τὰ σημήια, καὶ ἐδίωκον ὡς ποδῶν ἕκαστοι εἶχον, οὔτε
κόσμῳ οὐδενὶ κοσμηθέντες οὔτε τάξι. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν βοῇ **60**
τε καὶ ὁμίλῳ ἐπήισαν ὡς ἀναρπασόμενοι τοὺς Ἕλληνας·
Παυσανίης δέ, ὡς προσέκειτο ἡ ἵππος, πέμψας πρὸς τοὺς

---

5 ὁρέοντες Stein[1], van H. || ὁρμημένους **a** : ὡρμημένους 6 ἅπαντες **B** (sic Holder : sed αὐτίκα πάντες om. S) 7 ἤειραν Stein, van H. : ἤιραν **a** : ἦραν reliqui, Holder || ἕκαστος **B**Marc. *z*, Holder, van H. || ἧκον **B** 8 τάξει **B** 60. 2 ἐπῆσαν BMarc. || ἁρπασόμενοι RS(V)

---

his rebuke so meekly in c. 58 *supra*, or where were the Thebans, the Makedonians? had he issued no orders to his own right wing?

5. **ὁρμημένους διώκειν**, 'in full pursuit of.' *διώκειν* is treated as a 'telic' infinitive; but the 'purpose' is really fully contained, or supplied by the verb *ὁρμᾶσθαι* as in 7. 4 *ὁρμᾶτο στρατεύεσθαι*, or c. 61 *infra* *ὁρμέατο βοηθέειν*, and the infinitive might be regarded not as having in itself telic, i.e. purposive force, but as being an ordinary limiting or definitive idea; in other words, as belonging not to the 'subjective' but to the 'objective' order. This view may equally prevail, even if *ὁρμημένους* be taken in a physical sense, of the actual motion.

6. **οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν βαρβαρικῶν τελέων ἄρχοντες.** If the army of Mardonios had really numbered 300,000 non-Hellenes, the officers here designated would have been the thirty myriarchs named in the army-list in 7. 61 ff., with allowance for deaths, promotions, etc. In fact they are the myriarchs of the Medes, Baktrians, Indians, Sakai, the four remaining *τέλη* which, with his own 'Persians,' were comprised in the *corps d'armée*; cp. c. 31 *supra*. The whole of the other *corps d'armée* under Artabazos is already on its way to Thrace! cp. c. 66 *infra*.

7. **ἤειραν τὰ σημήια**, 'raised the signals' (for battle, pursuit, or what not). In a Roman army the first sign of battle was the scarlet flag raised at headquarters; the trumpet-sound followed. Cp. Caesar, *B.G.* 2. 20. 1. Greek armies had apparently a very similar procedure; cp. Thuc. 1. 49, 63, 4. 42, 111, 7. 34, 8. 95 (Baehr). Something of the kind must have been in vogue in all armies, with any organization to speak of; cp. 7. 128 (on the fleet). Xenophon, *Kyrop.* 8. 5. 13, may be describing rather Greek than Persian organization, but the differences in this respect were probably not great.

ὡς ποδῶν ἕκαστοι εἶχον: *ποδῶν ἔχειν*, 'to be off for feet,' i.e. to be furnished with; *ἔχειν τινος εὖ, κακῶς*, or absolutely; cp. 8. 107, and almost this very phrase 6. 116. *ἕκαστοι*, i.e. each set, Medes, Baktrians, Indians, Sakai—it was a race among them to overtake the Greeks.

οὔτε κόσμῳ . . οὔτε τάξι: *κόσμος* is the general expression or the whole results of *νοῦς*: *τάξις* is the particular position in the battle-array; cp. 8. 86. The statement here of the chaos and the disorder of the Persian pursuit is perhaps exaggerated: the crossing of the river and river-banks would tend to bring about a certain amount of confusion.

60. 1. **βοῇ τε καὶ ὁμίλῳ**: *cum clamore ac tumultu*, Baehr. *βοή* is the 'battle-cry.' *ὅμιλος* in Homer is the 'ruck' as compared with the leaders. In Thuc. 4. 125. 2 *τὸν ψιλὸν ὅμιλον* as compared with *τοὺς ὁπλίτας*, cp. 4. 112. 3. But Thucydides (e.g. 2. 65. 4 contemptuously), Hdt. 5. 23, and 3. 81 (contemptuously) use it without reference to fighting (cp. 1. 88); and so too Homer, etc.

2. **ἀναρπασόμενοι**: cp. 8. 78.

3. **Παυσανίης δέ.** The narrative, the scene, changes to the Greek side; the time, or at least the situation, also goes back to a point reached, or anticipated, in c. 57 *supra ad f.*, *ὡς προσέκειτο ἡ ἵππος*. This point was there put early in the morning. If the Persian cavalry was really attacking the Lakedaimonians in any position accessible to cavalry, Pausanias and his men were likely to be having a bad time; but the Spartans

Ἀθηναίους ἱππέα λέγει τάδε. "ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀγῶνος μεγίστου προκειμένου ἐλευθέρην εἶναι ἢ δεδουλωμένην τὴν Ἑλλάδα, προδεδόμεθα ὑπὸ τῶν συμμάχων ἡμεῖς τε οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὑπὸ τὴν παροιχομένην νύκτα διαδράντων. νῦν ὦν δέδοκται τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν τόδε ποιητέον ἡμῖν, ἀμυνομένους [γὰρ] τῇ δυνάμεθα ἄριστα περιστέλλειν

4 ἱππέα: ἄνδρα Marc. 5 ἐλευθερίην id. 6, 7 οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι et οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι abesse malit van H. 8 δέδεκται (*palam est*) Cobet, van H. || τοενθεῦτεν P*z* || τόδε Stein[3]: τὸ **a** etc. Stein[1 2]: om. **β**, Holder, van H. 9 ἡμῖν **β**Pcorr. *z*: ὑμῖν || γὰρ secl. Stein[3]

were now 10 stades up the *ὑπωρέη*, above the Moloeis, on the Argiopion: how could the cavalry come by them? Is the cavalry attack on the Lakedaimonians in this place anything more than a transfer of the sufferings of the previous day, c. 49 *supra*? If more, did any *Lochos* suffer except perhaps that of Amompharetos? Was not the bulk of the Persian cavalry engaged elsewhere?

4. **ἱππέα.** It is doubtful, at best, whether the Spartans had any mounted men or *aides-de-camp*; he is perhaps only the double of the *ἱππεύς* in c. 54 *supra*. This man might have been one of *τῶν καλουμένων ἱππέων*, cp. 8. 124, but he would have had a good deal of ground to cover a-foot, if he had really been despatched in the circumstances here supposed.

ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι. Is this the proper formula from Pausanias to Aristeides, or has the story-teller (or source) the fear of the Demos before his eyes? Cp. c. 45 *supra*. This is not the only or the greatest improbability in the message.

ἀγῶνος μεγίστου προκειμένου. Pausanias knows that the supreme hour is come.

5. **ἢ δεδουλωμένην** (the permanent state, rather than the single act?) seems to add the less likely alternative; cp. 7. 104 *ἐπικρατέειν ἢ ἀπόλλυσθαι*. A perfectly open question has co-ordinate *ἢ . . ἤ*, cp. 7. 11.

6. **προδεδόμεθα . . διαδράντων:** Pausanias (*a*) wastes time by telling the Athenians what they know only too well already—if the story in c. 55 *supra* (cc. 52–57) had been true, as there related; (*b*) repeats the very words of Mardonios above, addressed to the Aleuadai, *ὑπὸ τὴν παροιχομένην νύκτα* (*καὶ οἱ πάντες ὁρῶμεν*) *διαδράντας*. There is, however, some virtue in the word *διαδράντων* here; for it supports the hypothesis that the Greek centre had not all retired on precisely the same point, but that at this moment the Greek forces are at four distinct positions: the Lakedaimonians on the Argiopion, the right centre at the Island, or thereabouts, the left centre at the Heraion, and the Athenians apparently 'on the plain.'

8. **νῦν ὦν** comes to the point; cp. c. 48 *supra*.

δέδοκται perhaps only means 'it is perfectly clear,' without reference to any antecedent agreement, or formal resolution; yet none of the passages quoted by Stein, in support of a simple *constat*, is quite convincing; 4. 68 *δέδοκται τοῖσι πρώτοισι τῶν μαντίων αὐτοῖσι ἀπόλλυσθαι* points to law or enactment, 6. 109 *δέδοκται τὰ πείσονται παραδεδομένοι* to a decree or resolution, 8. 110 *πρότερον δεδογμένος εἶναι σόφος* is perhaps merely anachronistic, cp. 8. 124; c. 87 *infra* *δέδοκται τοῖσι Ἕλλησι* is a decision, an actual resolution taken. Cp. also c. 45 *supra*. Even in this case there seems no adequate reason for weakening the force of the term and the tense, c. 55 *supra*. Pausanias has actually summoned the Athenians to his side: that arrangement was probably part of the *δόγμα* imperfectly recorded c. 51 *supra* *βουλευομένοισι δὲ τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι ἔδοξε κτλ.* The eventuality of the Lakedaimonians and the Athenians finding themselves isolated by the retirement of the centre had been foreseen and provided for; dimly and unconsciously this fact is here involved in the formula. The **γάρ** in the next sentence is superfluous.

9. **περιστέλλειν:** 2. 90 *περιστείλαντας ὡς κάλλιστα θάψαι* (*αὐτόν*), cp. 6. 30, passages exhibiting a more primary use of the verb than the present one,

ἀλλήλους. εἰ μέν νυν ἐς ὑμέας ὅρμησε ἀρχὴν ἡ ἵππος, χρῆν δὴ ἡμέας τε καὶ τοὺς μετ' ἡμέων τὴν Ἑλλάδα οὐ προδιδόντας Τεγεήτας βοηθέειν ὑμῖν· νῦν δέ, ἐς ἡμέας γὰρ ἅπασα κεχώρηκε, δίκαιοι ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς πρὸς τὴν πιεζομένην μάλιστα τῶν μοιρέων ἀμυνέοντες ἰέναι. εἰ δ' ἄρα αὐτοὺς ὑμέας καταλελάβηκε ἀδύνατόν τι βοηθέειν, ὑμεῖς δ' ἡμῖν τοὺς τοξότας

10 *ἡμέας* Marc. || *ὥρμησε* (CP), Stein[1] || *χρὴν* AB 11 *μετ' ἡμέας* z 15 *βωθεῖν* van H. || *τούς* <*γε*> Naber, van H.

especially with accus. of the person. With neuter or inanimate objects it is common: *τοὺς νόμους* 2. 147, cp. *τὸν νόμον* 3. 31, *τὸ τοιοῦτο περιστέλλειν* 3. 82, *πόλισμα* 1. 98. Theokritos 15. 75 *ἄμμε περιστέλλων* (*ἐν καλῷ εἴης*) seems to be the nearest parallel to the present case.

10. **εἰ μὲν νυν . . ἡ ἵππος.** This argument, or appeal, admits that the Athenians, though apparently 'on the plain,' were not attacked by the cavalry—while the Lakedaimonians, who were on the *ὑπωρέη, φοβεόμενοι τὴν ἵππον* c. 56, were being attacked, *ex hypothesi*, by the cavalry. This hypothesis seems absurd. It is no use saying that Pausanias is merely speaking of the 'Persian' cavalry; he makes no distinction, and cavalry is cavalry. What was the Theban, the Thessalian, the Makedonian cavalry about all this time, even if there were no Persians, Medes, Baktrians, Indians, or Scyths on 'the plain'? Either the Athenians were in a position where they could not be attacked by cavalry, or the cavalry on the right wing had arranged not to attack them.

ὅρμησε: the active, intransitive, of actual or physical motion.

The exception made in favour of the Tegeatai is probably more Attic than Laconic, cp. c. 26. All the rest of the Greeks are 'traitors,' have betrayed the cause of Hellas (**τὴν Ἑλλάδα**, sc. *γῆν, συμμαχίην*). The Athenians recognize only themselves, the Spartans and Tegeatai, as having had any hand in this victory, and they depreciate the services even of the Spartans and Tegeatai as much as possible. Just here, they are on the defensive.

ἀρχὴν: cp. 8. 128.

χρῆν δή: far more emphatic is the apodosis without *ἄν*, denoting a duty unconditionally; cp. Madvig, § 118.

12. **ἅπασα κεχώρηκε**: again an admission that the Athenians were free from cavalry assaults. (Strictly speaking, 'the whole cavalry' would include that of the medizing Greeks.)

13. **δίκαιοι ἐστέ**: the personal and idiomatic construction; cp. c. 27 (Athenian speech).

τὴν πιεζομένην μάλιστα τῶν μοιρέων seems to suggest that the Lakedaimonians were, at this moment, the division of the Greek forces that was being most hard pressed. The plural genitive *μοιρέων* emphasizes the fact of this division, a tactical not an accidental result. The word *μοῖρα*, however, cannot be pressed as a technical term in the mouth of a Spartan; even if the word *μόρα* was already in use at Sparta (which is doubtful; cp. notes c. 53 *supra*), this story is not a Spartan story, and the word is of frequent occurrence in Hdt. For a parallel to the present case cp. 4. 120. With *πιέζειν* cp. 8. 142.

14. **εἰ δ' ἄρα αὐτ. ὑμ. καταλελάβηκε ἀδύνατόν τι βοηθέειν**, 'if (as we hardly suppose) anything has occurred to you making it impossible to assist us.' *ἀδύνατον τί idem valet ac ἀδυνασία τις*, Schweighaeuser; so too Stein (who well cps. 1. 61, 6. 138 *δεινόν τι = δέος*; 7. 101 *ἡδύ τι = ἡδονή*). *ἄρα*, c. 58 *supra*.

15. **ὑμεῖς δ'**: the resumed subject (virtually) with the *δέ in apodosi*, cp. 7. 51, etc.

τοὺς τοξότας ἀποπέμψαντες χάριν θέσθε: a polite request, not to say command; the archers had not been sent yet: 'oblige us by the despatch of your Archers.' The Athenian corps of Archers has just been mentioned incidentally in c. 22, but not included in the army-list, or numbering of the forces, cp. notes to c. 29 *supra*; it was apparently 800 strong. The request for the loan of them ill sorts with the supposition that the Spartans had 40,000 *ψιλοὶ μάχιμοι, πᾶς τις παρηρτημένος ὡς ἐς πόλεμον l.c.*; it also implies or assumes that the Athenians themselves were not

ἀποπέμψαντες χάριν θέσθε. συνοίδαμεν δὲ ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τὸν παρεόντα τόνδε πόλεμον ἐοῦσι πολλὸν προθυμοτάτοισι, ὥστε καὶ ταῦτα ἐσακούειν." 61 ταῦτα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὡς ἐπύθοντο, ὁρμέατο βοηθέειν καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἐπαμύνειν· καί σφι ἤδη στείχουσι ἐπιτίθενται οἱ ἀντιταχθέντες Ἑλλήνων τῶν μετὰ βασιλέος γενομένων, ὥστε μηκέτι δύνασθαι βοηθῆσαι· τὸ γὰρ προσκείμενον σφέας ἐλύπεε. οὕτω δὴ μουνωθέντες Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ Τεγεῆται, ἐόντες σὺν ψιλοῖσι ἀριθμὸν οἱ μὲν πεντακισμύριοι Τεγεῆται δὲ τρισχίλιοι (οὗτοι γὰρ οὐδαμὰ

16 ὑμῶν χάριν Paris. 1634 || θέσθαι **B** (C cum ε supersc.) || σύνιδμεν Mehler, Cobet, van H. || ὑμῖν χάριν Marc. 61. 2 ὁρμέατο **α**: ὡρμέατο || βοηθεῖν C: βωθεῖν van H. 3 στίχουσι **α**CR 4 βασιλῆος z || ὥστε καὶ **B** 5 προκείμενον Rz || προσκείμενόν σφεας (CP), Stein[1], Holder, van H. 7 τρισχείλιοι van H.

in want of the Archers at this crisis, or should not have been. *χάριν θέσθαι*, cp. c. 107 *infra*.

16. **συνοίδαμεν δὲ ὑμῖν κτλ.** This interesting testimonial to the unparalleled zeal of Athens was hardly 'made in Sparta,' though it is put into the mouth of a Spartan. The phraseology again reproduces the speech of Mardonios: *ἐπαινεόντων τούτους τοῖσί τι καὶ συνῄδεατε* c. 58.

ὑπὸ τὸν π. τ. πόλεμον: cp. *ὑπὸ τὴν παροιχομένην νύκτα* above.

17. **ὥστε . . ἐσακούειν**, 'so as to give heed to this our petition,' i.e. *οὕτω πολλὸν προθυμότατοι ἐστὲ ὥστε* expressing a result, not an intention or purpose. For the present infinitive we might have expected the aorist infinitive, or (with a different sense) the future indicative! The construction preferred suggests perhaps a more continuous and immediate sequence (though not, of course, the actual fact, as present indicative might do; the sequence remains an ideal one). *ἐσακούειν* c. 9 *supra*; Baehr here supplies *ἡμῖν*, Sitzler *ἡμῶν*. The dat. pers. is expressed 1. 214 (or might be taken elegantly as 'ethical'); the gen. is found, e.g., Soph. *Ai.* 789 *τοῦδ' εἰσάκουε τἀνδρός*.

61. 1. **οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι**: they act *en masse* as above addressed, *ἄνδρες Ἀθ.*

2. **ὁρμέατο βοηθέειν**: cp. *ὁρμημένους διώκειν* c. 59. The pl.p. *ὁρμέατο* marks the depth, or intensity, of their emotion, or the instantaneous rapidity of their action. The position of **ταῦτα** is emphatic. **τὰ μάλιστα**, 8. 97. **ἤδη στείχουσι**: the Athenians are actually on the way to the support of the Lakedaimonians, or to effect a juncture with them, but fail to carry out their intention, or this manœuvre, in consequence of being attacked, or intercepted, by the medizing Greeks, or some of them. *στείχειν*, cp. c. 56 *supra*.

3. **οἱ ἀντιταχθέντες** = *οἱ ἀντιτεταγμένοι* c. 31 *supra*. The description of *οἱ ἀντιταχθέντες* as a part of (the) Greeks *τῶν μετὰ βασιλέος γενομένων* is rather curious at this point; in c. 31 they are described as *τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ* (i.e. *Μαρδονίου*) *ἐόντας Ἑλλήνων*.

4. **τὸ προσκείμενον**: collective for *οἱ προσκείμενοι*, cp. *τὸ ἀσθενέστερον* c. 31.

5. **οὕτω δή**, not of time so much as of causation. **μουνωθέντες**, 'without support': the Athenians could still fall back on Marathon, where, *μοῦνοι Ἑλλήνων δὴ* <*προ*>*μαχήσαντες τῷ Πέρσῃ*, they had defeated forty-six nations, c. 27 *supra*; whereas at Plataia there was but one, the Persian, opposed to the Spartans and Tegeans, c. 31 *supra*.

7. **πεντακισμύριοι**: i.e. 5000 Spartiate hoplites, 5000 Lakedaimonian hoplites, 35,000 helots in attendance on the Spartiates, 5000 in attendance on the Lakedaimonians, in accordance with the calculations in cc. 29, 30 *supra*. But the calculation for the *ψιλοί* at least has been disallowed; cp. notes to *ll.c.*; and perhaps the total number of hoplites ought to be reduced by a quarter, if not by a half.

τρισχίλιοι: i.e. 1500 hoplites, 1500 *ψιλοί*, *ibid.* The reassertion of

ἀπεσχίζοντο ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων), ἐσφαγιάζοντο ὡς συμβαλέοντες Μαρδονίῳ καὶ τῇ στρατιῇ τῇ παρεούσῃ. καὶ οὐ γάρ σφι ἐγίνετο τὰ σφάγια χρηστά, ἔπιπτόν τε αὐτῶν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ πολλοὶ καὶ πολλῷ πλεῦνες ἐτρωματίζοντο· φράξαντες γὰρ τὰ γέρρα οἱ Πέρσαι ἀπίεσαν τῶν τοξευμάτων

---

10 ἔπιπτόν τε Schaefer, van H., Stein[3]: ἔπιπτον δὲ (δ' **α**: δι' C) 12 γέρα Apr.**B** || τῶν om. *z*

---

these numbers at this point is remarkable: no allowance is made for losses previous. There was little or no excuse for the request to the Athenians for the *τοξόται*. And what a host the right wing was, compared with the Athenians, here, or at Marathon!

8. **ἀπεσχίζοντο**, middle, 'separated from': if the Athenians owed anything to the Plataians, e.g. at Marathon, the Spartans owed still more to the Tegeatai at Plataia!

ἐσφαγιάζοντο ὡς συμβαλέοντες Μαρδονίῳ. This statement comes abruptly and with a shock: it proves that the Spartans were contemplating not merely battle, and self-defence, but the assumption of the offensive (*συμβάλλειν* = *μάχης ἄρχειν*, cp. cc. 41, 45 *supra*). It suggests that the retirement of the Lakedaimonians was purely a *reculer pour mieux sauter*; it shows that everything was proceeding *en règle* in the Spartan position, Teisamenos (cc. 33, 36 *supra*) inspecting the sacrifices in order to determine by their aid, and possibly on a sign from Euryanax, or Pausanias, the right moment for the charge. On the verb *σφαγιάζεσθαι* cp. c. 72 *infra*.

9. **καὶ τῇ στρατιῇ τῇ παρεούσῃ.** These words refer presumably to the Persian forces with Mardonios, and imply that only a portion of his army was in action. (*a*) The corps of Artabazos was not there, c. 66 *infra*. (*b*) The Medes, Baktrian, Indian, Sakan corps were apparently coming on *pêle-mêle*, anyhow, c. 59 *supra*. (*c*) The medizing Greeks, so far as they were taking any part in the action at all (cp. c. 67 *infra*), were fully engaged with the Athenians (just above) and perhaps with other Greek corps. (*d*) The Persian cavalry, which has been reported above, c. 60, as engaged with the Lakedaimonians, but which now seems to be doing nothing against them, was perhaps engaged elsewhere (possibly against the Greek centre, or right centre, upon the Plataia-Athens road, cp. note to c. 52. 7). The army of Mardonios appears to be far less in being than the Greek forces themselves, each division of which, at least, is still a compact unit.

οὐ γάρ σφι ἐγίνετο τὰ σφάγια χρηστά: sc. *μάχης ἄρχουσι, συμβολὴν ποιευμένοις*, or such like. *χρηστά* is perhaps superfluous; cp. c. 36 *supra*.

10. **ἔπιπτον**, 'were being killed,' as distinguished from those who were merely wounded: they were all alike sitting on the ground (cp. c. 72 *infra*) and probably crouching under their shields (cp. c. 48 *supra*), as they had, no doubt, been doing the greater part of the previous day.

ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ here at least covers some time in duration; cp. c. 56 *supra*. The proportion of wounded to killed is unfortunately not stated: in an ordinary conflict between two heavy-armed Greek forces it was probably not great; but in the present case no doubt it was unusually large (*πολλῷ πλεῦνες*): only 91 Spartiates at most were killed, cp. c. 70 *infra*.

12. **φράξαντες γὰρ τὰ γέρρα οἱ Πέρσαι.** The use of the *γέρρον* (cp. 7. 61) proves that the Persians here in action are infantry. The exact nature of the contrivance here described is in some doubt. Rüstow supposed that each Persian fixed his long light wicker shield in the ground by means of a point below: such 'a wall of shields' would, of course, offer but a slight protection against the push of the hoplites. Others (cp. Baehr *ad l.*, and esp. Stein *ad l.*) suppose that the Persians had devised a new plan against the Greeks: *συνεφόρησαν τὰ γέρρα ἕρκος εἶναι σφίσι* c. 99 *infra*. Yes, no doubt at Mykale, where the Persians were acting throughout on the defensive; but not here at Plataia (or rather, in front of Hysiai!) where they were advancing to the attack. In this case, at most, the individual

[πολλὰ] ἀφειδέως, οὕτω ὥστε πιεζομένων τῶν Σπαρτιητέων καὶ τῶν σφαγίων οὐ γινομένων ἀποβλέψαντα τὸν Παυσανίην πρὸς τὸ Ἥραιον τὸ Πλαταιέων ἐπικαλέσασθαι τὴν θεόν, χρηίζοντα
62 μηδαμῶς σφέας ψευσθῆναι τῆς ἐλπίδος. ταῦτα δ' ἔτι τούτου

---

13 πολλὰ 'interpolatum videtur' van H.: seclusi 15 ἡραῖον R, Gaisford, Palm || χρήιζοντα A: χρήζοντα CMarc.: χρῄζοντα z 16 σφεας z

---

soldier fixed his shield in the ground, in line with his neighbours, so that there was a front, a screen, a fence of shields (*φράγμα* 8. 52, *φραγμός* 7. 36, 142), hence *φράξαντες* here. (The helots may have been throwing stones.)

13. **ἀφειδέως**: cp. c. 39 *supra*; here in a somewhat different sense, *largiter*, *copiose*, cp. 1. 163, 207 (Schweighaeuser).

πιεζομένων: cp. *πιεζομένην* c. 60 *supra*; the Spartans are acting still strictly on the defensive—they are, in fact, apparently doing nothing, still unable *χρήσασθαι τῇ χειρί* (c. 72 *infra*).

14. **τῶν σφαγίων οὐ γινομένων**: Baehr says, *χρηστῶν hic optime carebit oratio.* Why, then, not everywhere? Cp. 7. 134, and cc. 41 *supra*, 62 *infra*. The sign they are awaiting is the sign in favour of their rising up and going for the Persians.

ἀποβλέψαντα τὸν Παυσανίην. Did Pausanias 'raise his eyes' (Rawlinson)? Did he look 'up' to the Heraion? Was he on lower ground? Or did he do more than 'look away to,' 'fix his eyes upon' the Heraion? The upward look is not essential to *ἀποβλέπειν* 7. 135 (cp. *ἀναβλέπειν*, though not as in 2. 111). For what reason did Pausanias fix his gaze on the Heraion? *Ex hypothesi* in order the better to invoke the goddess. What did he see? Could he see the Greek left, or left centre, in front of the temple, c. 52 *supra*? Could he see any signal? If there was such a signal given, what intimation did it convey? Or was he directing a signal to that quarter? (Cp. c. 69. 6 *infra*.)

15. **τὸ Ἥραιον τὸ Πλαταιέων.** Was it really the Heraion he looked to? Was there more than one Heraion in the neighbourhood? There were at least three temples of Eleusinian Demeter, though Hdt. only mentions one of them (cp. c. 57 *supra*); there was (so far as known) only one temple of Hera, though Hdt. so carefully specifies its Plataian possessive. It was doubtless the principal temple of the district; but strategically more may have been going on at the temple of Demeter, the Plataian one, at this moment, just as later at the Hysian; cp. c. 57 *supra*. (There was an Heraion at Koroneia, Pausan. 9. 34. 3, apparently the only other one in Boiotia.)

ἐπικαλέσασθαι, to invoke, summon to his aid; cp. 8. 64; here, probably, in audible tones.

16. **μηδαμῶς σφέας ψευσθῆναι τῆς ἐλπίδος.** This is the very *εὐχή* of Pausanias. What was the *ἐλπίς*, for the fulfilment of which he prayed? Was it merely victory as such? Or not rather such a 'sign' as would justify his assuming the offensive? In either case the commander is fully in favour of doing battle; for he is surely not hoping simply to make good his retreat! But the intimate connexion between the *εὐχή* and the *ἐλπίς*, between the *εὐχή* and the *σφάγια χρηστά*, and the coincidence of these with the transition from 'passive resistance' to active and offensive tactics, compel us to believe that at this point the situation on the field of battle was such that gods and men, on the Greek side, believed the hour was come to deliver the attack, to charge home upon the foe, behind his fence of shields.

Perhaps two or three things had happened, e.g. (*a*) the Persian infantry had been drawn across the Asopos in disorder, and were now massed, at short range, behind the feeble barrier of the *γέρρα*, like sheep for the slaughter, before the Argiopion, and the Plataian temple of Demeter; (*b*) the Persian cavalry was, perhaps, far off, or quite out of fighting range, and held in check, so far as the road in the rear was concerned, by the right centre in the Plataia-Athens Pass, or thereabouts; (*c*) from the left came word, or sign, that there was nothing to fear in that quarter; the Thebans alone, of the king's Greek allies, showing fight.

(Blakesley long ago (1854) boldly said that the hope of Pausanias was to bring

ἐπικαλεομένου προεξαναστάντες πρότεροι οἱ Τεγεῆται ἐχώρεον ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους, καὶ τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι αὐτίκα μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν τὴν Παυσανίεω ἐγίνετο θυομένοισι τὰ σφάγια χρηστά· ὡς δὲ χρόνῳ κοτὲ ἐγένετο, ἐχώρεον καὶ οὗτοι ἐπὶ τοὺς Πέρσας, καὶ οἱ Πέρσαι ἀντίοι τὰ τόξα μετέντες. ἐγίνετο δὲ πρῶτον περὶ τὰ γέρρα μάχη. ὡς δὲ ταῦτα ἐπεπτώκεε, ἤδη ἐγίνετο ἡ μάχη ἰσχυρὴ παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ Δημήτριον καὶ χρόνον ἐπὶ πολλόν, ἐς ὃ ἀπίκοντο ἐς ὠθισμόν . . . τὰ γὰρ

62. 2 ἐπικαλευμένου z ‖ πρότερον **B** 4 ἐγένετο **a** (Holder), AB, Stein[(1)], (van H.): minus recte, ut videtur 5 ἐγένετο Schaefer, Gaisford, Stein[2] (AB, Stein[(2)]): ἐγίνετο Stein[1] (S ap. Gaisf.) 6 ἀντίοι ἕστασαν? Stein 7 γέρα S 8 ἡ om. **B**, Holder 9 ἐσὸ AB ‖ ὠθησμόν Cpr.P ‖ lacunam indic. Stein[3]

the whole army of the enemy to action at close quarters: "the problem for Pausanias was to keep his troops perfectly in hand . . until the onset of the enemy became so general that they would no longer have it in their power to avoid a pitched battle," i.e. upon Pausanias' own terms.)

62. 2. προεξαναστάντες πρότεροι οἱ Τεγεῆται. The source, or sources, followed by Hdt. for the battle itself are not too favourable to the Spartans, and apparently prefer to give the Tegeatai what credit is going; cp. c. 70 *infra.* It may, of course, be that the men of Tegea were first on the move; if so, it was by order of Pausanias, for some tactical reason of the moment; but it is more probable that Spartans and Tegeatai advanced together.

πρότεροι is redundant, cp. 4. 145. **προεξαναστῆναι**, cp. 8. 59, indicates that they were sitting or lying down; cp. c. 72 *infra.*

ἐχώρεον ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους: like the Athenians at Marathon; but the *δρόμῳ ἵεντο* of 6. 112 quite surpasses this advance! The *ἐχώρεον ἐς* and the *ἐχώρεον ἐπί* just below mark a distinction without much difference. **χρόνῳ κοτέ** marks, perhaps, the impatience of the waiters rather than the actual length of time: contr. *χρ. ἐπὶ πολλόν* just below.

6. **οἱ Πέρσαι ἀντίοι τὰ τόξα μετέντες,** 'the Persians put away their bows and stood their ground to meet them,' having recourse to their other weapons, short spears, daggers (7. 61). What exactly they did with the bows is not clear; perhaps they actually flung them away: *μετιέναι πολλὰ τῶν δακρύων*, c. 16 *supra*, is to let them drop. Cp. 3. 128 *μετῆκάν οἱ τὰς αἰχμάς*, after which the *δορυφόροι* had recourse to their *ἀκινάκας*. The *μάχη περὶ τὰ γέρρα* which now ensues is really *πρῶτον* in relation to what follows; but the preceding episode, while the Persians are showering shots on the Spartans from behind the fence of shields, is an essential part of the battle-piece. **ἤδη** just below practically = *δεύτερον*.

7. **ἐπεπτώκεε** more literally than *ἔπιπτον* above, but still a mild way of putting it: Stein renders *niedergeworfen waren.*

8. **ἰσχυρή** is of course predicative.

παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ Δημήτριον. Hdt. knows only of one Demetrion in the region, cp. c. 57 *supra*; there were two, if not three, that might come into the account. It is here a problem not merely which Demetrion is in question, but what space, what change of place, if any, here intervenes between the *μάχη περὶ τὰ γέρρα* and the *μάχη ἰσχυρὴ παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ Δημήτριον*. The shields had been overthrown; their owners probably perished or fled. There may be a considerable amount of ground traversed between the *γέρρα* and the *Δημήτριον* here in question, and the bulk of the men who struggled with the Spartans, under the temple walls, may not be the same men who had stood their ground, higher up the hills, behind the *γέρρα*. The Demetrion here in question may be the 'Hysiatan,' and its site may still be marked by the church of St. Demetrion, though the Spartan position up by the Moloeis may have been about, or in front of, the Plataian Demetrion.

9. **ὠθισμόν.** One might have thought that there would have been 'pushing'

δόρατα ἐπιλαμβανόμενοι κατέκλων οἱ βάρβαροι. λήματι μέν νυν καὶ ῥώμῃ οὐκ ἥσσονες ἦσαν οἱ Πέρσαι· ἄνοπλοι δὲ ἐόντες καὶ πρὸς ἀνεπιστήμονες [ἦσαν] καὶ οὐκ ὅμοιοι τοῖσι ἐναντίοισι σοφίην, προεξαΐσσοντες [δὲ] κατ' ἕνα καὶ δέκα καὶ πλεῦνές τε καὶ ἐλάσσονες συστρεφόμενοι, ἐσέπιπτον ἐς τοὺς Σπαρτιήτας
63 καὶ διεφθείροντο. τῇ δὲ ἐτύγχανε αὐτὸς ἐὼν Μαρδόνιος, ἀπ' ἵππου τε μαχόμενος λευκοῦ ἔχων τε περὶ ἑωυτὸν λογάδας

10 λήματι PMarc. : λήμματι 11 ἔσσονες ἔσαν z || οἱ πέρσαι **B**, om. **a** (Holder) 12 πρὸς secl. Krueger || ἦσαν secl. van H., Kallenberg, Holder, Stein³ : ἦσαν οἱ Πέρσαι R (Stein⁽¹⁾) || ὁμοῖοι CPMarc. z || ἀντίοισι **B**, Schaefer ('male' van H.) 12, 13 καὶ et σοφίην del. Sitzler || δὲ secl. Stein³ (virgula pro puncto post σοφίην posita) || καὶ ante πλεῦνές om. **B** 14 ἐλάττονες CMarc. **63.** 1 μαρδόνιος ἐὼν Marc.

before the *γέρρα* were overthrown. So no doubt there had been: Hdt. seems to use *ὠθισμός* for fighting at the closest quarters (without special reference to its etymological sense), cp. 7. 225, 8. 78.

In this particular case, if the battle has shifted down the ridge, and is now going forward beside the Demetrion (as above located), the fugitive Persians would probably be met by swarms advancing to the assault, or support, none too regularly, and escape would be doubly difficult. But we cannot be sure that the words which follow do not describe the scene immediately on the overthrow of the *γέρρα*. Stein⁵, indeed, marks a lacuna after *ὠθισμόν* on the ground that the next sentence is not in logical or natural sequence of the argument or narrative: the now-exposed barbarians seized on and tried to break the large heavy spears of the Spartans—no doubt in vain.

10. **λήματι μέν νυν κτλ.** This generous tribute to the valour or spirit (*λῆμα* 7. 99) and bodily strength (*ῥώμη* 1. 31) of the Persians is rather out of place in the very midst of a description of the actual engagement; at any rate it interrupts a narrative which has already become involved in some obscurity, and when resumed, just below, grows still more unintelligible.

11. **ἄνοπλοι**, without *ὅπλα*, i.e. the shields (and other heavy arms associated therewith). There was a great inferiority of armature on the Persian side for fighting at close quarters: nothing could have compensated for that (other things, strength and courage, being equal) but superior tactics, skill, address; but *ἐπιστήμη*, but *σοφίη* were also on the side of the Greeks; cp. 7. 211.

13. **προεξαΐσσοντες**: the *προ-* is here local, not temporal. The tactics described are almost unintelligible of a retreating force. Single combatants, or small groups, separate themselves from the main body and rush forward, out of the ranks, form or rally in bands (*συστρεφόμενοι*, cp. c. 18 *supra*), some larger some smaller, charge the Spartans, and are annihilated.

Perhaps the obscurity arises from Hdt. not distinguishing clearly between those Persians who were in retreat and the various forces hurrying up to their support.

63. 1. **τῇ δὲ ἐτύγχανε αὐτὸς ἐὼν Μαρδόνιος**: a more explicit local definition of the exact position of Mardonios in the battle would be worth a good deal for the reconstruction of the piece. Was he *παρ' αὐτῷ τῷ Δημητρίῳ*, and, if so, which Demetrion? Was he really at the head of his troops, and himself leading the assault (cp. c. 59 *supra*)? Or was he, where he should have been, in a position to co-ordinate and direct his whole forces?

ἀπ' ἵππου τε μαχόμενος λευκοῦ: the specific mention, and memory, of the fact that Mardonios was mounted on a white horse might seem to imply that those about him were unmounted, or at least not mounted on white horses. (His mount was perhaps a Nesaian; cp. 8. 40.)

2. **λογάδας Περσέων τοὺς ἀρίστους χιλίους**: the reference to 8. 113 is not quite direct or obvious, but is generally

Περσέων τοὺς ἀρίστους χιλίους, ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐπίεσαν. ὅσον μέν νυν χρόνον Μαρδόνιος περιῆν, οἳ δὲ ἀντεῖχον καὶ ἀμυνόμενοι κατέβαλλον πολλοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων· ὡς δὲ Μαρδόνιος ἀπέθανε καὶ τὸ περὶ ἐκεῖνον τεταγμένον ἐὸν ἰσχυρότατον ἔπεσε, οὕτω δὴ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἐτράποντο καὶ εἶξαν τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι. πλεῖστον γὰρ σφέας ἐδηλέετο ἡ ἐσθὴς ἔρημος ἐοῦσα ὅπλων· πρὸς γὰρ ὁπλίτας ἐόντες γυμνῆτες ἀγῶνα ἐποιεῦντο. ἐνθαῦτα ἥ τε δίκη **64**

3 δὴ *z* 5 οἳ δὲ C, Stein[2], Holder: οἱ δὲ **a**, Stein[1], van H.: οἴδεν R(V) || κατεβάλλοντο edd. vett. (Gaisf.) || τῶν: τοὺς R 7 ἐὼν Apr.B: om. Marc. || οἱ ἄλλοι om. C 9 ἐρῆμος CPMarc. *z* 10 ἐόντας B (Gaisf.) || γυμνῆται Ask.: γυμνῆτας B || ἀγῶνας **β**: τὸν ἀγῶνα Iacobitz

taken to signify *τὴν ἵππον τὴν χιλίην* there specified, though not described as *λογάδας*. In 7. 40 *ἱππόται χίλιοι ἐκ Περσέων πάντων ἀπολελεγμένοι* form the head of the marching column; and a second chiliad of cavalry, similarly described, precedes the Immortals (apparently); besides these two chiliads of select cavalry there are two chiliads of select infantry, *αἰχμοφόροι*. The chiliad here mentioned might be any one of these four chiliads, and the mere fact that Mardonios himself is mounted hardly decides the question.

3. **ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐπίεσαν**: sc. *οἱ Πέρσαι*. The statement is astonishing for two reasons: (*a*) the aorist *ἐπίεσαν* instead of the imp. *ἐπίεζον*, especially after the number of antecedent imperfects, is a puzzle; (*b*) the statement describes the action of an advancing, an attacking party, not the action of a retreating party, and the Persians were already in retreat in the previous chapter. But the sequence of events in the narrative may be inaccurately chronologized. This sentence (*τῇ δὲ ἐτύγχανε . . ἐπίεσαν*) emphasizes the rôle of Mardonios in the battle, and may hark back to a point already passed by the general narrative in the previous chapter. This suggestion might account, perhaps, for the occurrence of the anomalous aorist: it is virtually equivalent to a pluperfect in time.

4. **ὅσον μέν νυν χρόνον Μ. περιῆν**: the actual time may be synchronous with the *χρόνον ἐπὶ πολλόν* of c. 62, during which *ἐγίνετο ἡ μάχη ἰσχυρὴ παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ Δημήτριον*. The corresponding sentence begins **ὡς δὲ Μαρδόνιος ἀπέθανε** (when Mardonios had been killed). **οἳ δὲ ἀντεῖχον** is the apodosis with *δέ*; the action described is that of men subject themselves to assault rather than attacking. The difficulty may be solved by the supposition above, that there was a temporary rally of the Persians *παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ Δημήτριον*, where Mardonios himself sat on horseback, surrounded doubtless by his staff and bodyguard, which is here distinctly acting on the defensive (*ἀντεῖχον, ἀμυνόμενοι*).

6. **τὸ περὶ ἐκεῖνον τεταγμένον**: neut. abst. for concrete = *οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν τεταγμένοι*, cp. c. 61 *supra*. There is nothing to suggest that this body is cavalry, rather the reverse. **ἔπεσε**, was cut to pieces, or fell mortally wounded each in his place; cp. *ἔπιπτον* c. 61 *supra*.

7. **οὕτω δή**: the narrative, having started afresh with Mardonios, now arrives again at the point previously reached, in general terms, in c. 62 *ad f.* The *τροπή* here (**ἐτράποντο**) must be in immediate sequence to the *ὠθισμός* there, and the observation on the Persians' *ἐσθής* here is exactly parallel to the reflexion there upon their inferiority in arms and skill.

9. **ἐδηλέετο**, 'contributed to their destruction'; the effect is, however, not positive, but negative, privative. **γυμνῆτες**, 'light-armed foot-soldiers,' a word not elsewhere used by Hdt., but cp. Tyrtaios, 11. 35, quoted c. 48 *supra*.

64. 1. **ἥ τε δίκη τοῦ Λεωνίδεω**. At this point Hdt. treats the battle as over, the victory as won, and goes off on a number of side issues, oracular, portentous, biographic, anecdotal, to wit, the fulfilment of a Delphic utterance; the providential preservation of the Demetrion from defilement; the fate of Mardonios,

τοῦ φόνου τοῦ Λεωνίδεω κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριον τοῖσι Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἐκ Μαρδονίου ἐπετελέετο, καὶ νίκην ἀναιρέεται καλλίστην ἁπασέων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν Παυσανίης ὁ Κλεομβρότου τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδεω· τῶν δὲ κατύπερθέ οἱ προγόνων τὰ οὐνόματα εἴρηται ἐς Λεωνίδην· ὡυτοὶ γάρ σφι τυγχάνουσι ἐόντες. ἀποθνῄσκει δὲ Μαρδόνιος ὑπὸ Ἀειμνήστου ἀνδρὸς ἐν Σπάρτῃ λογίμου, ὃς χρόνῳ ὕστερον μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ ἔχων ἄνδρας

64. 2 τὸ τοῖσι **B** 3 γενόμενον excidisse susp. Kallenberg || ἐπιτελέετο **B**, Schaefer, Gaisford 5 τῶν . . . ἐόντες suspecta habeo 6 οὗτοι **a**CMarc. 7 ἀΐμνήστου **a** : ἀριμνήστου **B**, Plutarch. *Aristid.* 19, Holder, van H. : cf. c. 72 infra || ἀνδρὸς ἐόντος ἐν Marc. 8 χρόνον id.

and that of the man who slew him; the glory of Pausanias.

2. **κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριον**: the reference is clear, though not explicit, to the anecdote 8. 114 *supra*, which of course was an anachronism; given the death of Mardonios at Plataia by the hands of a Spartan (?), and the 'prediction' was inevitable. This whole chapter (with the possible exception of a couple of sentences) reads like an insertion by Hdt. into the first draft of his history, and may perhaps be put down to his 'second hand'; cp. Introduction, § 9.

3. **νίκην ἀναιρέεται κτλ.** Hdt. treats the victory as a *fait accompli*, as though the whole battle had been simply between Mardonios with his Persians on the one side and Pausanias with his Spartans or Lakedaimonians on the other; the centre, the left wing, are treated here as negligible quantities: this treatment can hardly be Attic, or phil-Attic tradition, or theory, but it might very well be 'Delphic,' cp. Thucyd. 1. 132. 2, or picked up at Delphi by Hdt. himself, or his authorities. On the formula καλλίστην . . τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν cp. 8. 105. 3. Is it not a metrical tag? (τῶν ἡμέες ἴδμεν).

νίκην ἀναιρέεσθαι reportare victoriam 6. 103, cp. c. 33 *supra* (ἀγῶνας), Ὀλυμπιάδα 6. 70 etc. The express recognition of the personal merits or service of Pausanias (to the exclusion of Euryanax) in this passage is remarkable: Plataia is his victory, the most ideal (καλλίστην) victory on record—Marathon, Salamis not excepted! The use of the patronymic, here raised to the third power, *ἐκ τριγονίας*, is also remarkable: plainly and purely for rhetorical effect.

5. **τῶν δὲ . . ἐόντες** is, however, an addition with somewhat an unfortunate effect; if genuine, it is a very clear reference back to 7. 186: such a *bathos* can hardly belong to the first draft of the description of the great battle; the language reads, however, like authentic Hdt. **κατύπερθε**, cp. 5. 28. **οἱ**, possessive, or perhaps 'ethical' dat. **ἐς Λεωνίδην**, either 'down to Leonidas,' or 'with reference to Leonidas,' *à propos* of Leonidas. (As Leonidas could not be included, the latter seems the preferable rendering.)

6. **ὡυτοὶ . . ἐόντες**, not *ταὐτὰ . . ἐόντα*. Rawlinson, doubtless feeling the literary and stylistic flaw of this passage, translates it very loosely: 'I omit to recount his other ancestors, since they are the same with those of Leonidas.'

7. **ἀποθνῄσκει . . ὑπό**: cp. c. 37 *supra*.

Ἀειμνήστου ἀνδρὸς ἐν Σπάρτῃ λογίμου. It is unfortunate that there is any uncertainty in the exact form of the proper name, though 'Aeimnestos' and 'Arimnestos' come to much the same sense; cp. c. 72 *infra*. (Some persons with an inability to give value to the *rho* would pronounce the two forms indistinguishably.) Blakesley very acutely suggested that this *ἀνὴρ ἐν Σπάρτῃ λόγιμος* was not himself a Spartiate; for (i.) Plutarch (*de or. def.* 5, *Mor.* 412) says Mardonios was killed by a stone, and a Spartiate would not be throwing stones (but cp. c. 55 *supra*!); (ii.) Thucydides (3. 52. 5) has a Plataian, one 'Lakon, son of Aeimnestos,' and an *ἀνὴρ ἐν Σπάρτῃ λόγιμος* would be very likely to have a son named *Λάκων*. (But what, then, of his service in the Messenian war? see below.)

8. **ὃς χρόνῳ ὕστερον κτλ.** is certainly a reference to events in the *Pentekontaëteris*, and appears to be a reference to the

τριηκοσίους συνέβαλε ἐν Στενυκλήρῳ πολέμου ἐόντος Μεσσηνίοισι πᾶσι, καὶ αὐτός τε ἀπέθανε καὶ οἱ τριηκόσιοι.

65 *ἐν δὲ Πλαταιῇσι οἱ Πέρσαι ὡς ἐτράποντο ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, ἔφευγον οὐδένα κόσμον ἔς <τε> τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ ἑωυτῶν*

---

9 *συνέβαλλε* C || *μεσηνίοισι* **B**C: *Μεσσηνίοισί τε* z 10 *πᾶσι*: *ἀποστᾶσι* Naber **65.** 2 *πλαταίηισι* **a**: *πλαταίησι(ν* V) **B** || *ἐτράπησαν* z 3 <*τε*> coni. Stein[1], adm. van H., Stein[3] || *ἑωυτὸν* **B**

'third' Messenian war (464–454 B.C.). The reference is obscure. Hdt. does not clearly indicate that the war is between the Lakedaimonians and Messenians; he does not describe the character or nature of the corps of 300 men under Aeimnestos; he does not say on which side Aeimnestos was fighting; he gives no details or circumstances in regard to the engagement. This is, in short, one of the obscurest references to contemporary events in the whole work. Hdt., however, does not say that Aeimnestos was a Spartan, nor that the men under his command were Spartans. Blakesley says: "no doubt Aeimnestos commanded the garrison which was intended to maintain military possession of the country." But that seems to me very doubtful: how came a Plataian by such an appointment? Rather we might suppose that the Plataian, with a contingent of his fellow-citizens, 300 strong, was (*pace ἰδίᾳ* in the following) with the Athenian contingent in the Messenian war; cp. Thuc. 3. 54. 5 *καὶ ὑμῖν, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἰδίᾳ, ὅτεπερ δὴ μέγιστος φόβος περιέστη τὴν Σπάρτην μετὰ τὸν σεισμὸν τῶν ἐς Ἰθώμην Εἱλώτων ἀποστάντων τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐξεπέμψαμεν ἐς ἐπικουρίαν· ὧν οὐκ εἰκὸς ἀμνημονεῖν* (*Λάκων* son of *Αἰείμνηστος* is speaking, 427 B.C.).

ἔχων, 'commanding.'

9. **τριηκοσίους**: if this was *τὸ τρίτον μέρος* the full number of Plataians at that time would be 900. In c. 28 *supra* there are 600 with the Athenians on the left; that may be ⅔ (and ⅓ may be with the Spartans, cp. c. 72 *infra*, or the number of Plataians in 464 B.C. may somewhat have risen. In 429 B.C. it had fallen again, cp. *l.c.*).

συνέβαλε: i.e. *συμβολὴν ἐποίησε*, cp. c. 41 *supra*.

Στενυκλήρῳ: the old Dorian, or quasi-Dorian, capital of Messenia (cp. Strabo 361), where Kresphontes had built his palace, and established a residence (cp. Pausan. 4. 3. 7), situate on a plain (Pausan. 4. 33. 4) in the midst of the land, a natural meeting-place for the Messenians (Paus. 4. 6. 6)—in fact, the centre of the upper of the two plains into which hollow Messenia naturally divides; cp. Curtius, *Peloponnesos* ii. 125 f. It was an unwalled place, however, and has left no remains *in situ*, *ib.* 136.

65. 1. **ἐν δὲ Πλαταιῇσι**, 'to return to Plataia,' the name of the city for the land; cp. c. 16 *supra*. Even so, there may be an inaccuracy. The actual scene of the Persian repulse was perhaps rather in the confines of Hysiai than in the land of Plataia proper; though the position occupied at the Androkrateion and Gargaphia had no doubt been *ἐν τῇ Πλαταιίδι*, cp. c. 25 *supra*.

2. **ἐτράποντο** Baehr takes as imperf. passive, but renders *in fugam conversi sunt*; Stein (more accurately) *in fugam vertebantur*.

3. **οὐδένα κόσμον**: cp. 8. 117. The Persians may have advanced originally in good order; not so, however, the rest of the *βαρβαρικὰ τέλη*, cp. c. 59 *supra*.

τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ ἑωυτῶν appears to be distinguishable from *τὸ τεῖχος τὸ ξύλινον* to this extent, that the *στρατόπεδον* was considerably larger than the *τεῖχος*, cp. c. 15 *supra*. But Stein's theory that the *τεῖχος* was on the south side of the Asopos and the *στρατόπεδον* on the north side of the Asopos, and (apparently) quite distinct and separate, is hardly satisfactory. The distinction between the *στρατόπεδον* and the *τεῖχος* is perfectly sound and intelligible, even if both were on the same side of the river and locally continuous with each other; it is a distinction analogous to that between *ἡ πόλις* and *τὸ ἄστυ*. Again, the addition of the words *τὸ ἐποιήσαντο ἐν μοίρῃ τῇ Θηβαΐδι* cannot possibly mean that the *τεῖχος* was on Theban territory while the *στρατόπεδον* was not! And if that were the meaning, then the *στρατόπεδον* would have to be placed

καὶ ἐς τὸ τεῖχος τὸ ξύλινον τὸ ἐποιήσαντο ἐν μοίρῃ τῇ Θηβαΐδι. θῶμα δέ μοι ὅκως παρὰ τῆς Δήμητρος τὸ ἄλσος μαχομένων οὐδὲ εἷς ἐφάνη τῶν Περσέων οὔτε ἐσελθὼν ἐς τὸ τέμενος οὔτε ἐναποθανών, περί τε τὸ ἱρὸν οἱ πλεῖστοι ἐν τῷ βεβήλῳ ἔπεσον. δοκέω δέ, εἴ τι περὶ τῶν θείων πρηγμάτων

---

5 *θῶυμα* Pz, Stein[1] || *περὶ τῆς* z 7 *περὶ τὸ ἱρόν· οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι* **B**Pz (‘fortasse rectius si *π. τ. ἱ.* ut glossema deleveris’ van H.) || *τῷ* fortasse delend. cens. Kallenberg

---

south of the river, and the *τεῖχος* north, whereas Stein places the *τεῖχος* south, and the *στρατόπεδον* north.

In my opinion the camp (*στρατόπεδον*) and the fort (*τεῖχος*) were continuous; the camp was on the left (north) bank of the Asopos, along the road from Erythrai to Thebes; the fortified portion of the camp may have been projected across the river on to the south bank, so that a part of the river flowed right through the fortification, or at least a *tête de pont* may have been fortified to the south of the river on the said road. This *τεῖχος* was an *ἔρυμα* to the *στρατός* in any case, and a *κρησφύγετον* in case of disaster; cp. c. 15 *supra*. It probably contained the quarters of all the combatants, and assuredly of the Persians and picked troops.

4. **ἐν μοίρῃ τῇ Θηβαΐδι**: *μοῖρα* here is as strictly topical as it ever can be; cp. 8. 23 *τῆς Ἑλλοπίης μοίρης γῆς δὲ τῆς Ἱστιαιήτιδος τὰς παραθαλασσίας χώρας πάσας ἐπέδραμον*, 5. 57 *οἴκεον δὲ τῆς χώρης ταύτης* (sc. *τῆς γῆς τῆς νῦν Βοιωτίης καλεομένης*) *ἀπολαχόντες τὴν Ταναγρικὴν μοῖραν*. There is nothing to restrict the word here to one side of the Asopos, least of all the south side. *ἡ Θηβαιὶς μοῖρα* is all the portion of Boiotia in the dominion of Thebes; it cannot be distinguished from *ἡ Θηβαὶς γῆ* nor from *οἱ τῶν Θηβαίων χῶροι* (cp. c. 15 *supra*). But, at least as against Plataia and Hysiai, the Asopos was its boundary, 6. 108.

5. **θῶμα δέ μοι**: the cause of this marvel Hdt. explains just below as a direct divine interposition to bring about the given result. On the supposition that the Demetrion in question is marked by the church of St. Demetrion Dr. Grundy explains the fact by the lie of the ground: the Persians in rushing back to their laager and camp would naturally avoid the delay of climbing up the hill, on the top of which the Demetrion was situate, and would naturally rush along the lower slopes and stream valleys (A[4], A[5]) either side the ‘Long Ridge.’ This plausible suggestion remains equally valid whether the routed fugitives were mounted or on foot. But it is possible that Mardonios himself had occupied this hill during the battle, in order to survey the action; and Hdt. (or his source) would have had small excuse for wonder if the area had not been within the field of battle. At an earlier stage in the proceedings the Demetrion may have been held by the Spartans (Amompharetos? cp. c. 53 *supra*). Hdt. does not say that no Greeks fought or fell within the enclosure. See also next note.

τῆς Δήμητρος τὸ ἄλσος: this grove (cp. 7. 197) is a new feature in the Herodotean landscape and may very suitably be imagined growing round the church of St. Demetrion, upon the hilltop, which is of decidedly conical formation. Hdt. apparently conceives this point as the very centre and stress of the fight, as *οἱ πλεῖστοι*, sc. *τῶν Περσέων*, fell in the immediate vicinity of the Holy Place, though upon unconsecrated ground (*ἐν τῷ βεβήλῳ*, cp. Thuc. 4. 97. 3). As the Persians are here in flight the slaughter among them may well have been great, but we can scarcely feel quite sure that the case of the Persians was quite as Hdt. reports, no doubt *bona fide*; the statement is so exactly what would afterwards have been believed and said *ad maiorem Deae gloriam*.

8. **δοκέω δέ**: an expression of uncertainty; cp. *οὐ δοκέω* 7. 186, and *δόκησιν δὲ δεῖ λέγειν* 7. 185—a proceeding unobjectionable in purely human matters, such as the number of the Persian forces, but perhaps not advisable *περὶ τῶν θείων πρηγμάτων*. This reserve is not an expression of incredulity on Hdt.'s part, but seems to arise rather from a belief in the vindictive nature of the gods, and

δοκέειν δεῖ, ἡ θεὸς αὐτή σφεας οὐκ ἐδέκετο ἐμπρήσαντας τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι ἀνάκτορον.

Αὕτη μέν νυν ἡ μάχη ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο ἐγένετο. Ἀρτάβαζος **66**
δὲ ὁ Φαρνάκεος αὐτίκα τε οὐκ ἠρέσκετο κατ' ἀρχὰς λειπομένου Μαρδονίου ἀπὸ βασιλέος, καὶ τότε πολλὰ ἀπαγορεύων

---

9 *δοκεῖν* A, van H. || *ἐδέξατο* CPMarc. *z* || *τὸ ἱρὸν* del. Valckenaer, Holder, van H. 10 *ἐλευσῖνοι* R || *ἀνακτόριον* **B**Pcorr. *z* : del. Bredow **66.** 1 *τοσοῦτον* **B***z* 2 *ἀρέσκετο* *z* || *καταρχὰς* ABR*z* || *λιπομένου* *z* 3 *ὑπὸ* van H. || *βασιλῆος* *z*

---

an apprehension that such speculations might be visited with a nemesis: *οὐ γὰρ ἐᾷ φρονέειν μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἄλλον ἢ ἑωυτόν* 7. 10.

9. **σφεας οὐκ ἐδέκετο**, 'rejected them,' refused them entrance. *δέκεσθαι*, sc. as *ἱκέτας*, or *ἐπὶ ξεινίῃ*. Would the Greeks have spared the lives of any Persians found in the Holy Place, or simply have taken them out and slain them *ἐν τῷ βεβήλῳ*? Hdt. does not go so far as to say that Demeter interfered directly to procure the victory of the Greeks, any more than Hera, c. 61 *supra*. The story of the war is comparatively free from the miracle manifest, apart from the Delphic apology (8. 35 ff.). Cp. Introduction, § 11.

ἐμπρήσαντας . . τὸ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι: this outrage has not been expressly recorded before; cp. cc. 13, 14 *supra*. Mardonios has put the saddle on the wrong horse, c. 42 *supra*. It is not clear whether the destruction at Eleusis was in 480 B.C. (8. 50), or in the present year (c. 14 *supra*). Baehr defends both **ἱρόν** and **ἀνάκτορον** in this passage. Valckenaer had condemned *τὸ ἱρόν*, Bredow *ἀνάκτορον*. Hdt. nowhere else uses the word. Euripides applies it to (1) Delphic temple of Apollo, *Andr.* 1157; (2) Tauric temple of Artemis, *Iph. T.* 41, 66; (3) Trojan temples, *Troad.* 15: Pausanias, 2. 14. 4, of a part of the Demetrion at Keleai, near Phleiûs. In Athenaeus first, apparently, we get the word used with a special or restricted reference to Eleusis: 213 *τὸ σεμνὸν ἀνάκτορον τοῖν θεοῖν*, cp. 167. Dr. Frazer has suggested that it designated the Great Hall of Initiation (*τὸ τελεστήριον*), cp. n. to Pausan. *l.c.* But Pollux, 1. 9, still has *ἀνάκτορον* (seemingly as an adj.) for the *ἄδυτον* or any *χωρίον ἄβατον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, i.e. of any temple. *ἀνάκτορον* is, of course, the house of the *ἄναξ* (or *ἄνασσα*).

66. 1. **αὕτη . . ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο ἐγένετο**, 'in this battle nothing further took place,' i.e. the battle between the Spartans and the Persians, which is here treated as though it were whole and complete in itself. To the Persian combatants must be added the other non-Hellenic divisions, which have also been represented as taking part in 'this battle,' cp. c. 59 *supra*. Hdt.'s method of treating the conflict between the Persians and Spartans as one battle, and the conflict between the Athenians and Thebans as another, corresponds probably more or less to differences in his sources; while some failure in his sources may help to account for his inadequate treatment of the fortunes of the centre. Moreover, Hdt. here makes an effort to mark the exact point in the struggle at which Artabazos took his departure (when the battle had reached this point, Artabazos—*ἐποίησε τοιάδε*). With him, perhaps, departed the Makedonians and others in the Persian right wing, which he probably commanded.

Ἀρτάβαζος . . ὁ Φαρνάκεος: the patronymic is so little called for by the occasion, that it may better be supposed a repetition from the source of the eccentric story which ensues.

2. **αὐτίκα . . κατ' ἀρχάς**, 'from the very first'; cp. for the expression 7. 88, and for the situation referred to 8. 115, 126. The use of **ἀπό** instead of *ὑπό* is remarkable; cp. 7. 102, 5. 2, etc.

3. **καὶ τότε**: not the point reached in the narrative, in the immediate context, but a much earlier one, viz. in c. 41 *supra* (a backward reference).

πολλὰ ἀπαγορεύων οὐδὲν ἤνυε recalls the formula put into the mouth of a Persian in the story of Thersander, c. 16 *supra*: *πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατέειν.*

οὐδὲν ἤνυε, συμβάλλειν οὐκ ἐῶν· ἐποίησέ τε αὐτὸς τοιάδε ὡς οὐκ ἀρεσκόμενος τοῖσι πρήγμασι τοῖσι ἐκ Μαρδονίου ποιευμένοισι. τῶν ἐστρατήγεε ὁ Ἀρτάβαζος (εἶχε δὲ δύναμιν οὐκ ὀλίγην ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς τέσσερας μυριάδας ἀνθρώπων περὶ ἑωυτόν), τούτους, ὅκως ἡ συμβολὴ ἐγίνετο, εὖ ἐξεπιστάμενος τὰ ἔμελλε ἀποβήσεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης, ἦγε κατηρτημένως, παραγγείλας

---

6 ὁ om. **a**C, Holder 7 *τέσσαρας* ACR(V) || *αὐτὸν* **B** 8 *ἐγένετο* **B** 9 *συμβήσεσθαι* S || *ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης* delenda suspic. Kallenberg || *ἦγε* **B**Pz : *ἤϊε* || *κατηρτημένως* **a**, Stein, Holder : *κατηρτισμένως* **B**, van H.: *κατηρτημένος* CPMarc.: *κατηρτισμένος* z, Krueger, Baehr: *κατηρτημένους* ? Blakesley : *κατηρτισμένους* ? van H.

---

4. **συμβάλλειν οὐκ ἐῶν**, prohibiting, arguing against, 'trying to prevent a general engagement,' cp. c. 41 *supra*; *μηδὲ ἀνακινδυνεύειν συμβάλλοντας.*

ἐποίησέ τε: the *τε* marks the climax (after the two items marked by the previous **τε** and **καί**, cp. c. 58 *supra*).

5. **ἀρεσκόμενος**: passive (not middle, as in 6. 128). The active is used with accus. of the person, as well as with the dative (3. 142), so 3. 34, 4. 78, and 7. 160.

ἐκ, instead of *ὑπό*, cp. 7. 175; cp. c. 64 *supra*.

The *asyndeton* which follows may help to mark the laboured character of the apology for Artabazos, which is far from coherent or close in its argument. As Stein points out, Hdt. (or rather, perhaps, his source) is anxious to explain and justify the treacherous conduct of Artabazos; while Blakesley regards the difficulty as arising from an "Hellenic interpretation" of a proceeding which the Greeks did not understand: he even accepts the suggestion of 8. 126 that the reputation of Artabazos was raised by his conduct at Plataia, that is, the skill with which he brought off his division. It is quite possible that the action, position, and proceedings of Artabazos have not been correctly envisaged by Greek tradition, and that, imperfect information having created a problem, apologetics were called in to reconcile the facts of the subsequent career of Artabazos with his supposed conduct at Plataia. But if Artabazos was really at Plataia with 40,000 men, no amount of insight or foresight, of wit or wisdom, could conceal or excuse his shameful treachery to Mardonios, and thereby to the Persian cause. However, the Greek idea that he was in Boiotia, or within reach of Mardonios at the time of the battle, may be erroneous. It is this idea which creates the problem.

6. **εἶχε**, 'was in command of . .' **δύναμιν**, cp. 4. 155. The 40,000 men of this passage may be reconciled with the 60,000 of 8. 126 by the supposition that Artabazos had lost 20,000 in the siege of Poteidaia and his other operations; but the harmony is our own doing. We are in the presence of more or less independent stories, and, it may be, of independent estimates of the numbers under Artabazos' command. Each figure represents a division of 50,000, or one-sixth of the Grand Army; but, perhaps, in the one case a myriad of cavalry has been added, and in the other case subtracted, or not included. The position assigned to Artabazos in tradition makes him only a little inferior to Mardonios, and discounts the larger estimate for the latter's army. Moreover, 40,000 is just about the figure for the Makedonian and Hellenic contingent, minus the Thebans (cp. next c.), a coincidence which suggests that, if present at the battle of Plataia, he was in command of the right wing, including the Makedonians, medizing Greeks, etc. Their attitude and conduct may help to explain his.

7. **ἀνθρώπων**, as frequently; cp. Index.

8. **εὖ ἐξεπιστάμενος**: the verb is doubly reinforced, and denotes real knowledge. Artabazos was one *προειδὼς πλεῦν τι*, c. 41 *supra*, and his conduct itself (according to the story) secures the fulfilment of his previsions and predictions. **ἀπό** here = *ἐκ*, **ὅκως** = *ὡς*.

9. **κατηρτημένως**. Stein prefers the participial adverb, and understands it as meaning *wohl vorbereitet*, *in wohl überlegter Weise*, i.e. with all due prepara-

κατὰ τὠυτὸ ἰέναι πάντας τῇ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐξηγέηται <καὶ> ὅκως ἂν αὐτὸν ὁρῶσι σπουδῆς ἔχοντα. ταῦτα παραγγείλας ὡς ἐς μάχην ἦγε δῆθεν τὸν στρατόν. προτερέων δὲ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὁρᾷ καὶ δὴ φεύγοντας τοὺς Πέρσας· οὕτω δὴ οὐκέτι τὸν αὐτὸν κόσμον κατηγέετο, ἀλλὰ τὴν ταχίστην ἐτρόχαζε φεύγων οὔτε ἐς τὸ ξύλινον οὔτε ἐς τὸ Θηβαίων τεῖχος ἀλλ' ἐς Φωκέας, ἐθέλων ὡς τάχιστα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἀπικέσθαι. καὶ **67**
δὴ οὗτοι μὲν ταύτῃ ἐτράποντο· τῶν δὲ ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων τῶν

---

10 *κατὰ τοῦτο* **B**: *κατ' αὐτὸ* Pz || *ἐξηγέηται* **B**z: *ἐξηγῆται* reliqui, Holder, van H. || <*καὶ*> Stein[3] 11 *ἂν* om. **B** || *ὁρέωσι* z, Stein[1], van H. 12 *προτερέως* C: *προτερεύων* z || *ὁρᾷ* Stein[3]: *ὁρᾶι* **a**C: *ὥρα* **B**, Stein[1 2], Holder, van H. 15 *εἰς* R || *ξύλινον τεῖχος* S, Bekker, Palm et *τεῖχος* post *Θηβαίων* retinentes || *ἀλλὰ* **a** **67**. 2 *ἄλλων* secl. van H.

---

tion and reflexion on his part, deliberately, of set purpose. But the words *οὕτω δὴ οὐκέτι τὸν αὐτὸν κόσμον κατηγέετο* below point to the meaning of the word here, whatever its form, as having a more material reference to the order and appearance of the men being led: 'well-hung, well-adjusted, well-ordered.' The verb *καταρτάω* as virtually = *καταρτίζω* is curious, and in any case rare; cp. 3. 80 and App. Crit. Krüger has *κατηρτισμένος* with active or transitive force; *nachdem er sie geordnet hatte*, 'after putting them in battle-array' (or marching array); *κατηρτισμένους* (*Kampf-bereit*, Sitzler) is of course to be taken as passive.

10. **κατὰ τὠυτὸ ἰέναι . . τῇ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐξηγέηται κτλ.** Such directions might be given by the leader of a company, but are absurd as the general orders of the commander of a *corps d'armée*. *κατὰ τὠυτό* may mean 'in the same way' (merely anticipating *ὅκως . . σπουδῆς*), or 'in the same direction' (merely anticipating *τῇ . . ἐξηγέηται*), or it might be taken to cover both, or possibly it might have the sense of keeping together, not breaking ranks (cp. *πάντας*). They are to march all together, they are to follow him, and not to exceed or fall short of his pace or speed (*σπουδή*, cp. c. 89 *infra*. Mardonios had led his men *δρόμῳ*, c. 59 *supra*; Artabazos probably was leading his *βάδην*); and they can do all that by keeping their eyes on him (**ὁρῶσι**). Hdt. treats the march of 50,000 men as though it were the excursion of a small mountaineering party. The apologist may say that the general's orders were issued to his officers, myriarchs, chiliarchs; even so, they are irrational.

11. **ὡς ἐς μάχην . . δῆθεν**: apparently he led them at first in battle-array, and presumably in the direction of Plataia; but what was his starting-point? Was he on the Asopos, in command of the right? Or was he at Thebes, in command of reserves? Or was he even further away? He had been marching some time before the rout of the Persians came to his knowledge (**ὁρᾷ**).

12. **προτερέων**, cp. c. 57 *supra*. **καὶ δὴ** = *ἤδη*, c. 48 *supra*.

13. **οὐκέτι τὸν αὐτὸν κόσμον κατηγέετο.** He apparently changed from battle-array into marching order, substituting the *agmen* for the *acies*, and (**ἐτρόχαζε**) 'wheeled' round (or perhaps only 'wheeled along,' i.e. ran, cp. Xenoph. *Anab.* 7. 3. 46), fled to Phokis, with a view to reaching the 'Hellespont.' He had previously advocated their falling back on *τὸ τεῖχος τὸ Θηβαίων*, c. 41. Hellespont may here be used in the largest sense; he made for Byzantion c. 89.

67. 2. **τῶν δὲ ἄλλων . . ἐθελοκακεόντων.** 'The other Greeks' are in contrast to the Boiotians, and must be taken to cover the Makedonians, and to number, on Hdt.'s own showing, at least 40,000! cp. c. 32 *supra*.

τῶν μετὰ βασιλέος: cp. c. 61 *supra*. The action, or inaction, of these 'Hellenes' is most remarkable, and Hdt. seems to make curiously little of

μετὰ βασιλέος ἐθελοκακεόντων, Βοιωτοὶ Ἀθηναίοισι ἐμαχέσαντο χρόνον ἐπὶ συχνόν· οἱ γὰρ μηδίζοντες τῶν Θηβαίων, οὗτοι εἶχον προθυμίην οὐκ ὀλίγην μαχόμενοί τε καὶ οὐκ ἐθελοκακέοντες, οὕτω ὥστε τριηκόσιοι αὐτῶν οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ ἄριστοι ἐνθαῦτα ἔπεσον ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων. ὡς δὲ ἐτράποντο καὶ οὗτοι, ἔφευγον ἐς τὰς Θήβας, οὐ τῇ περ οἱ Πέρσαι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων ὁ πᾶς ὅμιλος, οὔτε διαμαχεσάμενος οὐδενὶ οὔτε τι
68 ἀποδεξάμενος, ἔφευγον. δηλοῖ τέ μοι ὅτι πάντα τὰ πρήγματα

3 βασιλέως R : βασιλῆος z 4 ἐπὶ συχνόν om. R 5 ἔχον z || μαχόμενοί **ß**P : μαχεόμενοί 6 αὐτέων z 8 οὐ τῇ περ Stein, Holder : οὐ τῇπερ Bekker, van H. : οὐκ ᾗ || post Πέρσαι interpunx. Holder, van H., plerique 9 διαμαχεσάμενοι Krueger || οὐδὲν R 10 ἀποδεξάμενός τι Pz : ἀποδεξάμενοι Krueger **68.** 1 τε ἐμοὶ **ß**

it. On his own showing some 40,000 of Mardonios' allies are useless, or worse than useless, in the supreme hour. None of the Greeks on the Persian side, with the exception of the Thebans, showed any fight; the whole right wing, with that one exception, was *hors de combat*. This arrangement left a fairly easy field for the Athenians. Was there not already an understanding to this effect? The omission of any explicit notice of the Makedonians at this point is remarkable. The action of Artabazos and his section of the army can hardly be divorced from the action, or inaction, of these medizing Greeks.

3. **Βοιωτοὶ Ἀθηναίοισι ἐμαχέσαντο.** This situation is apparently treated almost as a separate *μάχη*. *Βοιωτοί* might cover more than *Θηβαῖοι*. The golden shields dedicated by the Athenians at Delphi *ἀπὸ Μήδων καὶ Θηβαίων* (Aischines *in Ctesiph.* 116), if genuine, may represent the political position of the Thebans as heads of Boiotia at the time, but perhaps rather expresses the intensity of anti-Theban feeling at Athens. The very next words here show that even in Thebes the Thebans were divided.

4. **οἱ μηδίζοντες τῶν Θηβαίων** implies the presence of others; so too Thucyd. 3. 63. 3 f. (in a Theban speech).

6. **τριηκόσιοι αὐτῶν**: a favourite, perhaps a conventional figure. **οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ ἄριστοι** has a strong political flavour about it, though the immediate question is one of pure fighting.

7. **ἔπεσον ὑπό**: cp. c. 37 *supra*.

καὶ οὗτοι, 'as well as the Persians.' Can we be quite sure that the fight between the Athenians and the Thebans out-lasted the fight between the Spartans and the Persians? The tardy arrival of the Athenians at the *ξύλινον τεῖχος* (c. 70 *infra*) might be easily accounted for otherwise, by a greater distance to cover, by an initial doubt how far to pursue, and so on. Yet it is possible that the retreat, or flight, of the Thebans on the Persian right wing was determined not so much by the valour of the Athenians, as by the victory of the Spartans over the other wing. That consideration is obscured by the way in which Hdt. has isolated the operations upon the right from those upon the left, to say nothing of the retreat of Artabazos and his myriads!

8. **οὐ τῇ περ οἱ Πέρσαι**: by a different road to that taken by the Persians. No doubt the Thebans retreated along the direct road from Plataia to Thebes, while the Persians recrossed the Asopos (as far as possible) by the bridge on the other road, from Erythrai to Thebes.

τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων can hardly reinclude the medizing Greeks, who have been already accounted for, nor yet the men under the command of Artabazos, but rather refers to the nations, other than the Persians proper, included in the forces of Mardonios, cp. c. 31 *supra*; the *βαρβαρικὰ τέλη* of c. 59 *supra*. **ἄλλων** is idiomatic; neither the Persians nor the Thebans are here referred to as *σύμμαχοι*.

9. **ὅμιλος**: cp. c. 60 *supra*.

διαμάχεσθαι ought to mean 'to fight to a finish,' cp. c. 48 *supra*. **ἀποδέξασθαί** (N.B. middle) **τι**, cp. c. 27 *supra*.

68. 1. **δηλοῖ** Schweighaeuser, followed

τῶν βαρβάρων ἤρτητο ἐκ Περσέων, εἰ καὶ τότε οὗτοι πρὶν ἢ καὶ συμμεῖξαι τοῖσι πολεμίοισι ἔφευγον, ὅτι καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας ὥρων. οὕτω τε πάντες ἔφευγον πλὴν τῆς ἵππου τῆς τε ἄλλης καὶ τῆς Βοιωτίης· αὕτη δὲ τοσαῦτα προσωφέλεε τοὺς φεύγοντας, αἰεί τε πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων ἄγχιστα ἐοῦσα ἀπέργουσά τε τοὺς φιλίους φεύγοντας ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

Οἳ μὲν δὴ νικῶντες εἵποντο τοὺς Ξέρξεω διώκοντές τε καὶ 69
φονεύοντες. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ γινομένῳ φόβῳ ἀγγέλλεται τοῖσι

---

2 ἤρτηντο **B** 3 συμμεῖξαι van H., Stein[3] || ὅτε coni. Stein[1 2] 4 ὥρων **B**: ἑώρων 6 ἀπειργουσά libri: corr. Stein **69.** 1 τε om. Pz 2 φόνωι A[2]: πόνῳ Wesseling, 'fortasse recte' van H.

---

by Stein, takes as impersonal, cp. 2. 117. Blakesley objects to its impersonality and translates, 'it proves to me that . .,' a translation not incompatible with impersonality. In fact δηλοῖ should be more significant than δῆλόν ἐστι, but there is no expressed subject for it. **τε** seems to have a cumulative force, cp. c. 66 *supra*.

2. **ἤρτητο ἐκ**, 'depended on.' The pluperfect can hardly be pressed into meaning that all that is now a thing of the past, cp. 6. 109 *ταῦτα ὦν πάντα ἐς σὲ νῦν τείνει καὶ ἐκ σέο ἤρτηται*, 1. 125, 3. 19. **τὰ πρήγματα**, 7. 10. 34 f. *supra*.

οὗτοι cannot refer to the same body of men as the *οὗτοι* just above; but whether it refers to *οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες οἱ μετὰ βασιλέος* or to *τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων ὁ πᾶς ὅμιλος*, or more vaguely includes both, is not quite clear. The first reference is rather remote, the second rather pointless, inasmuch as Hdt. is here dealing with the action on the right wing of Mardonios' army. The clearest point would be made by the omission of c. 67, in which case *οὗτοι* would refer to Artabazos and the men under his command, as do the words *καὶ δὴ οὗτοι μὲν ταύτῃ ἐτράποντο*. Possibly c. 67 is an insertion by the author, and was not in the original draft of the battle-piece; it is intended to recall the Athenians to mind. If that is the case, the next sentence too is probably an addition (*οὕτω τε . . τῶν Ἑλλήνων*). Cp. Introduction, § 9.

3. **συμμεῖξαι**, of hostile congress, c. 48 *supra*.

4. **ὥρων**: sc. *φεύγοντας*.

πάντες ἔφευγον. In c. 63 *supra* the Persians have been routed, and in c. 65 have fled *ἐς τὸ τεῖχος τὸ ξύλινον*. In c. 66 Artabazos and his men have fled *ἐς Φωκέας*. In c. 67 the Thebans have fled *ἐς τὰς Θήβας*, and *ὁ πᾶς ὅμιλος* have followed the Persians.

πλὴν τῆς ἵππου: the cavalry generally, on both wings, may have covered the retreat, or 'flight,' to some extent; but the Persian left wing does not appear to profit much by its cavalry, while the Boiotian cavalry does appear as actively and efficiently engaged. The Persian camp is reached and captured, while the Thebans make good their retreat to Thebes. **τῆς τε ἄλλης καί** here may be rather perfunctory. The disappearance of the Persian cavalry on the left wing is something of a problem: did it ride off with Artabazos?

5. **τοσαῦτα** refers to what follows (=*τοσάδε*), viz. the cavalry kept close to the enemy and screened the men who were in flight. **ἀπέργουσα τοὺς φιλίους ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων** might rather have been *ἀπέργουσα τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀπὸ τῶν φιλίων*. With **πρὸς τῶν π.** cp. 8. 87.

69. 1. **οἳ . . νικῶντες**, 'the victors'—primarily the Lakedaimonians; cp. the message reported just below.

τοὺς Ξέρξεω: i.e. the barbarians (the term hardly includes *τοὺς μετὰ βασιλέος Ἕλληνας*). Mardonios is no more; but the phrase is perhaps merely conventional, and hardly chosen expressly with that reference.

2. **ἐν δὲ τούτῳ . . φόβῳ**, 'at the beginning of this rout.' **ἐν**, temporal, cp. c. 60 *supra*.

φόβος=*φυγή*, "the only sense in Homer" (L. & S.).

ἄλλοισι Ἕλλησι τοῖσι τεταγμένοισι περὶ τὸ Ἥραιον καὶ ἀπογενομένοισι τῆς μάχης, ὅτι μάχη τε γέγονε καὶ νικῷεν οἱ μετὰ Παυσανίεω· οἳ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ταῦτα, οὐδένα κόσμον ταχθέντες, οἱ μὲν ἀμφὶ Κορινθίους ἐτράποντο διὰ τῆς ὑπωρέης

---

3 ἄλλοισι om. R || περὶ τὸ ἡραῖον (ἱραῖον R) τεταγμένοισι **B** 4 τε om. Marc. 5 παυσανίεωι B 6 ὑπωρείης **B**

---

3. **τοῖσι . . περὶ τὸ Ἥραιον**: cp. c. 52 *supra*; it is admitted here too that they were τεταγμένοι. The whole centre, both right and left, is here apparently involved; see below.

4. **ἀπογενομένοισι τῆς μάχης**: *qui pugnae non interfuerunt* (Baehr). In 2. 85, 136, 3. 111, 5. 4 ἀπογίγνεσθαι means 'to die.'

μάχη τε γέγονε καὶ νικῷεν οἱ μετὰ Παυσανίεω, 'a battle has taken place, Pausanias and his men being victorious.' The combination of moods and tenses in this message is remarkable; the indicative and optative in somewhat similar fashion 8. 100 δώσει δίκην . . καὶ οἱ κρέσσον εἴη, 8. 111 ἦσαν ἄρα αἱ Ἀθῆναι μεγάλαι τε καὶ εὐδαίμονες, αἳ καὶ θεῶν χρηστῶν ἥκοιεν εὖ. The present optative here is remarkable: even in this context, with the antecedent perfect, it could hardly be imperfect (γέγονε can hardly mean merely 'has begun'). Just about the same moment, or a little later in the day, *ex hypothesi*, substantially the same news was spread through the army on the strand at Mykale, c. 100 *infra*; but here **οἱ μετὰ Π.** is emphatic, and does not include the Athenians.

5. **οὐδένα κόσμον ταχθέντες**: a suspicious assertion, reducing them almost to the level of the barbarians in c. 59 *supra*.

6. **οἱ μὲν ἀμφὶ Κορινθίους**: Schweighaeuser, Krueger, Baehr, and others, have interpreted this merely of the Korinthians, and so the corresponding phrase below merely of the Megarians and Phleiasians. This interpretation is neither grammatically nor materially tenable. The phrase means 'the Korinthians and those with them,' and plainly covers 'the right centre' as enumerated in c. 28 *supra*, comprising some 11,300 hoplites, in six (or eight) divisions, from the Korinthians on the extreme left (next the Lakedaimonians and Tegeatai) to the Mykenaians and Tirynthians on the right, i.e. just at the very middle of the Greek line.

This body, the right centre, is here dimly reported as betaking itself from the Heraion, where it had been duly disposed and drawn up in order (of battle), through, or over, the skirts of the mountain and the ridgeland, by the way leading up to the temple of Demeter.

This notice at first sight suggests that they are going to the help of Pausanias in the position of the Lakedaimonians as described in cc. 56, 57 *supra*. But Pausanias is *ex hypothesi* already victorious, and does not need their assistance; and in fact nothing more is heard of this body of men and their ill-starred movement, οὐδένα κόσμον ταχθέντες, started without waiting for any orders

There is the same ambiguity here as elsewhere in regard to the exact extent of the ὑπωρέη, in regard to the identity of the κολωνοί, in regard to the precise one of three Demetria which may have been involved in the movement; perhaps also as to the exact point of time at which this movement of the right centre took place. It is curious, too, that no message reaches this body of men summoning them (like the Athenians c. 60 *supra*) to the aid of Pausanias. (But cp. note to c. 61. 14 *supra*.) The precise sequence and chronology of the orders, messages, movements in various parts of the field of battle are not coherently presented by Hdt. Perhaps the division of the Greek army forming the right centre had been detached and deployed on to the road from Plataia to Athens (Dryoskephalai) for the purpose of holding it against the Persian cavalry, and was actually so engaged, while the Lakedaimonians were resisting the onset of the Persian infantry, lower down the slope, or had even already put the Persians to flight. In any case the line of march here indicated for the right centre is uphill from Plataia, and its objective cannot be marked by the present church of St. Demetrion, the site of which is far below the Heraion.

καὶ τῶν κολωνῶν τὴν φέρουσαν ἄνω ἰθὺ τοῦ ἱροῦ τῆς Δήμητρος, οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας *τε καὶ* Φλειασίους *διὰ τοῦ πεδίου τὴν λειοτάτην τῶν ὁδῶν. ἐπείτε δὲ ἀγχοῦ τῶν πολεμίων ἐγίνοντο οἱ* Μεγαρέες *καὶ* Φλειάσιοι, *ἀπιδόντες σφέας οἱ τῶν* Θηβαίων *ἱππόται ἐπειγομένους οὐδένα κόσμον ἤλαυνον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἵππους, τῶν ἱππάρχεε* Ἀσωπόδωρος *ὁ* Τιμάνδρου, *ἐσπεσόντες δὲ κατεστόρεσαν αὐτῶν ἑξακοσίους, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς κατήραξαν διώκοντες ἐς τὸν* Κιθαιρῶνα.

Οὗτοι *μὲν δὴ ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ ἀπώλοντο· οἱ δὲ* Πέρσαι **70**
καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὅμιλος, ὡς κατέφυγον ἐς τὸ ξύλινον τεῖχος,

7 *τὸν κολωνὸν* Marc. || *ἄνω* om. **B** 10 *ἀποδιδόντες* z || *τῶν* om. **B**, Holder 11 *ἐπηγομένους* Marc. 12 *τοὺς ἵππους* secl. van H. 13 *κατεστώρεσαν* B || *αὐτέων* z 14 *κατήρραξαν* Marc. z **70.** 1 post *λόγῳ* excidisse *ὄντες* vel *γενόμενοι* suspic. van H.

8. **οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας τε καὶ Φλειασίους.** The left centre, comprising the Megarians, Phleiasians, and those in their division, a force of 7300 hoplites, cp. c. 78 *supra*. Of them it might have been said that they *ἤισαν τὰ ἔμπαλιν ἢ οἱ ἀμφὶ Κορινθίους* (cp. c. 56 *supra*). As the right centre has moved, apparently E., or SE., to support, or cover, the right wing, so the left centre moves N., or NW., to support the left wing: **διὰ τοῦ πεδίου τὴν λειοτάτην τῶν ὁδῶν**, words which seem to carry a disparaging reflexion with them! Of course for the left centre to advance down hill, on to the plain, over which the road from Plataia to Thebes ran, to the support of the Athenians, who were evidently in difficulties (cp. c. 61 *supra*), was a gallant enough proceeding; but the Athenians do not appear to have been very grateful therefor.

10. **ἀπιδόντες**: cp. 8. 37.

12. **τῶν ἱππάρχεε**: cp. c. 20 *supra*; the *τῶν* should be referred to *ἱππόται*.

Ἀσωπόδωρος ὁ Τιμάνδρου. Of Timandros the father nothing more is known, but this Asopodoros may well be the father of that Herodotos, of Thebes, in whose honour Pindar composed an Epinikion, *Isth.* 1. The family, which was, of course, aristocratic and medizing, had some connexion with Orchomenos (*op. c.* 35); cp. c. 16 *supra*. To these circumstances may be due the remembrance of the exploit here recorded.

13. **κατεστόρεσαν αὐτῶν ἑξακοσίους.** This heavy loss, and the consequent flight of the left centre *ἐς τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα*, can hardly have taken place after the victory of the Athenians over the Boiotians already recounted in c. 67 *supra*; it was more probably its antecedent, or concomitant, at least in part; in other words, the support afforded to the Athenians, on the extreme left, by the left centre, enabled them to claim a success over the Thebans.

70. 1. **ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ**, (as) 'of no account,' cp. 7. 14, 57 (*ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ ποιέεσθαι*). Hdt. cannot have seen the monument at Megara, erected in honour of those who had fallen in the Persian war, with an epigram, in whole or part ascribable to Simonides (though of doubtful authenticity), containing a distich especially referable to the courage of the Megarians in facing the cavalry at Plataia; cp. c. 21 *supra*; Hauvette, *de l'authenticité etc.* pp. 7–8, 92–94; *C.I.G.* 1. 1051. The silence, or rather this explicit statement, of Hdt. might be added to the *raisons extrinsèques* against the authenticity of the epigram, or even against its existence in the time of Hdt. But such an argument ascribes too scientific a standard to Hdt.'s methods, and though the inscription is certainly late, the verses are certainly early.

οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὅμιλος. The narrative returns to the fortunes of the Persian left, the Greek right, cp. c. 65 *supra*. The *ἄλλος* is idiomatic ('besides,' 'as well'): even in their flight the Persians proper are not to be classed with *ὁ ὅμιλος, ὁ πᾶς ὅμιλος* of c. 67 *supra*.

ἔφθησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς πύργους ἀναβάντες πρὶν ἢ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ἀπικέσθαι, ἀναβάντες δὲ ἐφράξαντο ὡς ἠδυνέατο ἄριστα τὸ τεῖχος· προσελθόντων δὲ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων κατεστήκεέ σφι τειχομαχίη ἐρρωμενεστέρη. ἕως μὲν γὰρ ἀπῆσαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, οἳ δ' ἠμύνοντο καὶ πολλῷ πλέον εἶχον τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ὥστε οὐκ ἐπισταμένων τειχομαχέειν· ὡς δέ σφι Ἀθηναῖοι

---

4 ἐφράζοντο **B** 5 Ἀθηναίων Stein[(2)3], van H.: cp. comment. 6 ἐπήεσαν **B** 7 οἵδε **B** || ἔχον *z* || τῶν Ἀθηναίων Stein[(2)] (preli err.) 8 οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι Marc. *z*

---

3. **ἔφθησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς πύργους ἀναβάντες**: for the gramm. construction cp. 7. 142, c. 113 *infra*. This is the first (and last) appearance of the *πύργοι* on the *ξύλινον τεῖχος*. The defenders, at least the combatants among them, took their stand apparently not upon or below the wall, but above on these towers, from which they hurled weapons, stones, etc., against the assailants, no doubt.

4. **ἐφράξαντο**: *φράξαι*, *φράξασθαι* means properly 'to fence,' fortify, cp. 8. 51 and 7. 142 *ἡ γὰρ ἀκρόπολις τὸ πάλαι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ῥηχῷ ἐπέφρακτο*. (*φράξαντες*, 8. 7, 'blocked'.) But the exact nature of the operation here recorded is obscure. The time was past for 'strengthening' their wall by additional fortifications, nor would the ascent of the towers be the natural preliminary to such work. *φράσσειν* can hardly be watered down so as merely to = *φυλάσσειν*, but might perhaps be translated, 'put into a posture of defence.'

5. **προσελθόντων δὲ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων.** There is a certain clumsiness and obscurity in the way the **τειχομαχίη** is described. First, the Persians and the rest of the barbarian rout made good their escape into *τὸ ξύλινον τεῖχος*, and before the arrival of the 'Lakedaimonians' ascended the towers, and put the fort into a posture of defence. (It is not a case where pursuers and pursued entered together: either their lighter equipment or the intervention of the cavalry, c. 68 *supra*, enables the barbarian infantry to outstrip its pursuers. But were not a good many of the barbarians shut out of the fortification? And the pursuers were also retarded by the slaughter, c. 69 *supra*.) Next, the Lakedaimonians arrived at the fortification, and for a while were unable to effect an entrance; and there took place a *τειχομαχίη*. But cp. App. Crit. and next note.

6. **ἐρρωμενεστέρη.** If the vulgate reading above is maintained the comparative can only be a rhetorical elegance, unless indeed it means that the fighting was too much for the Lakedaimonians, 'more than they could cope with.' Stein takes **σφι** to refer not to the Persians only, but to both sides, Persians and Greeks. He also has substituted *Ἀθηναίων* for *Λακεδαιμονίων*. This emendation is not convincing. If adopted, the next sentence will hark back to explain the situation antecedent to the arrival of the 'Athenians' already recorded (cp. c. 61 *supra* *φράξαντες γὰρ κτλ.*, following *ἔπιπτον κτλ.*). **κατεστήκεε** is, of course, not simply = *ἦν* or *ἐγίνετο*, but *ἐρρωμενεστέρη* may be part of the predicate.

7. **οἳ δέ**: i.e. *δέ in apodosi* (cp. 7. 51), the **ἕως μέν** just before being answered by **ὡς δέ** below. *οἵ* = *οἱ Πέρσαι*. **πολλῷ πλέον εἶχον**, 'were getting the better of'; cp. *πλέον ἔχειν* 4. 3, and *οὐδὲν ἔλασσον εἶχον* c. 102 *infra*.

8. **ὥστε** = *ἅτε*, cp. c. 37 *supra*. Rawlinson instances the failures of the Spartans to subdue Eira, Ithome, Pylos: the story of the siege of Plataia (429–7 B.C.) is no less eminent a case. But the Athenians were not so very much better: the siege of Poteidaia lasted two years (432–30 B.C.); no assault on Syracuse occurred during the Athenian siege (414–13 B.C.). The defence of stone walls had always the advantage, in the absence of heavy machines and engines: fire or starvation were the chief hopes of the besiegers (cp. Thucydides, his essay in Poliorketics 2. 75–78). The Athenian reputation was more or less established at the time of the third Messenian war (Thuc. 1. 102. 2), and may have been enhanced in the assaults on Samos (440–39 B.C.) where some engines were perhaps employed, without much success (Plutarch,

προσῆλθον, οὕτω δὴ ἰσχυρὴ ἐγίνετο <ἡ> τειχομαχίη καὶ χρόνον ἐπὶ πολλόν. τέλος δὲ ἀρετῇ τε καὶ λιπαρίῃ ἐπέβησαν Ἀθηναῖοι τοῦ τείχεος καὶ ἤριπον· τῇ δὴ ἐσεχέοντο οἱ Ἕλληνες. πρῶτοι δὲ ἐσῆλθον Τεγεῆται ἐς τὸ τεῖχος, καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τὴν Μαρδονίου οὗτοι ἦσαν οἱ διαρπάσαντες, τά τε ἄλλα ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν φάτνην τῶν ἵππων ἐοῦσαν χαλκέην πᾶσαν καὶ θέης ἀξίην. τὴν μέν νυν φάτνην ταύτην τὴν Μαρδονίου ἀνέθεσαν ἐς τὸν νηὸν τῆς Ἀλέης Ἀθηναίης Τεγεῆται, τὰ δὲ

9 <ἡ> Stein[3] 11 ἤρειπον Marc. z 12 εἰσῆλθον Marc. 13 τὴν : τοῦ **B**z

Perikles 27, cp. Diodor. 12. 28. 3; the authority was merely Ephoros, and it is clear that the city was not captured by force); but it looks as if their reputation was based rather on the defensive aptitude of their own city, long walls, and fortified harbour than on the brilliance of their record in assaulting others. The Lakedaimonians not having any walls of their own of course could not τειχομαχέειν. Cp. Thucyd. 1. 90. 2. The case of 'wooden walls' was vastly different; cp. 8. 52 *supra*.

ὡς δέ σφι Ἀθηναῖοι προσῆλθον. A fresh stage is reached on the arrival of the Athenians; the ἰσχυρὴ τειχομαχίη now set up hardly enforces the τειχομαχίη ἐρρωμενεστέρη recorded just above. The sequel shows that the claim made for the Athenians is untenable: it is the Tegeatai who effected a breach (perhaps even before the arrival of the Athenians).

10. **ἀρετῇ τε καὶ λιπαρίῃ**: cp. c. 21 *supra*, where the Megarians claim credit for this combination in a defensive position, a case to which the first term would more naturally apply. The question here is of scaling the wall (**ἐπέβησαν τοῦ τείχεος**) and effecting a breach.

11. **ἤριπον**: sc. αὐτό, or even αὐτοῦ. In either case the use of the 2nd aorist with transitive sense is remarkable; cp. App. Crit. Hdt. has the 1st aor. ἐρεῖψαι in 1. 164, but cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

12. **πρῶτοι δὲ ἐσῆλθον Τεγεῆται**: this statement is hardly reconcileable with the immediately preceding context; those who first scaled the wall and effected a breach must also have been the first to enter the fort, and *vice versa*; if the Tegeatai were the first to enter, the Tegeatai doubtless effected a breach for themselves. The latter is the more probable alternative; the former is discounted by the Attic bias in Hdt.'s source or sources for the story of Plataia, and by the obvious anomaly in this record.

τὴν σκηνὴν τὴν Μαρδονίου: the tent, or pavilion, of Mardonios was probably in or near the centre of the fortified camp, and the fact that the Tegeatai pillaged it would not seem to throw any light upon their place of entrance. The tent was, perhaps, the same tent as Xerxes had used; cp. c. 82 *infra*.

15. **θέης ἀξίην**: that Hdt. had himself seen this bronze manger (φάτνη) cannot be inferred from this description or phrase; cp. c. 25 *supra*; but he might have added this sentence or two upon the manger and its destination after his visit to the Peloponnesos. It has a somewhat parenthetical air, and might very well be 'second-hand.' Cp. Introduction, § 9.

16. **τῆς Ἀλέης Ἀθηναίης.** This goddess and her temple at Tegea are mentioned elsewhere, 1. 66, and in such a way as rather to suggest autopsy (more directly than anything in the present passage). The temple as it existed in Hdt.'s day was burnt down in the year 395–4 B.C., and the splendid temple described by Pausanias 8. 45 ff. was a later edifice; but, though it still contained the fetters of the Spartans (8. 47. 2), Pausanias makes no mention of the manger of Mardonios. If the Tegeatai really found the φάτνη τῶν ἵππων in the σκήνη of Mardonios, the white charger (c. 63 *supra*) must have been stabled in rather close proximity to his rider's quarters. On the further contents of the pavilion cp. c. 82 *infra*.

Alea as a title of Athene is perhaps to be connected with the Arkadian town of the same name mentioned by Pausanias

ἄλλα ἐς τὠυτό, ὅσα περ ἔλαβον, ἐσήνεικαν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι. οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι οὐδὲν ἔτι στῖφος ἐποιήσαντο πεσόντος τοῦ τείχεος, οὐδέ τις αὐτῶν ἀλκῆς ἐμέμνητο, ἀλύκταζόν τε οἷα ἐν ὀλίγῳ χώρῳ πεφοβημένοι τε καὶ πολλαὶ μυριάδες κατειλημέναι ἀνθρώπων. παρῆν τε τοῖσι Ἕλλησι φονεύειν οὕτω ὥστε

17 *ἐσηνείκαντο* **B** 18 *στίφος* R Marc. 19 *οὐδέ* Stein : *οὔτε* || *τις* : *τῆς* B || *αὐτέων* *z* 20 *χώρῳ* : *χρόνω* **B**Cpr. *z*, del. Krueger, van H. || *κατειλημέναι* P, Schweighaeuser : *κατειλλημμέναι* R : *κατειλλημέναι* V : *κατειλημμέναι* **a** etc.

(8. 23. 1), containing a sanctuary of Athene Alea, a goddess worshipped also in Mantineia (*ib.* 8. 9. 6). The cult was not confined actually to historic Arcadia ; Pausanias saw a wooden image of Athene Alea on the road from Sparta to Therapne (3. 19. 7), and Xenophon (*Hell.* 6. 5. 27) mentions a ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀλέας apparently in the same place at the time of the first Theban invasion of Lakonia (369 B.C.). Tegea was undoubtedly the most important centre of the cult in historic times ; 'Aleus' was reckoned the city's founder (Pausan. 8. 45. 1), but Pausanias seems to distinguish clearly between the sanctuary of Athene Poliatis at Tegea and that of Athene Alea (*ib.* 8. 47. 5).

17. **ἐς τὠυτό . . ἐσήνεικαν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι** : i.e. they brought into the common stock ; it is not quite clear whether τοῖσι Ἕλλησι is an ethical dative (*pro bono publico*) or loosely constructed with τὠυτό, into the same place, or the common heap, to which all the rest of the Greeks brought their spoils. There seems to be some little feeling of jealousy over the possession by the Tegeatai of the bronze manger, and a hint that they had secreted it. The probability is that they were allowed to retain it as a special reward for having been first into the Persian camp.

18. **στῖφος** : cp. c. 57 *supra.*

πεσόντος τοῦ τείχεος : the fortification 'fell' as soon as a breach had been made in the wall.

19. **ἀλκῆς ἐμέμνητο** : an Homeric reminiscence, e.g. *Il.* 5. 112. Cp. Baehr.

ἀλύκταζον : an *hapaxlegomenon*, apparently connected with ἀλύω (poetic), 'to be distraught,' frantic. Cp. ἀλαλύκτημαι *Il.* 10. 94 (as if from ἀλυκτέω).

20. **κατειλημέναι** : a conj. of Schweighaeuser, "undoubtedly a true one," Blakesley ; it is in fact the reading of P ! cp. App. Crit.

21. **ἀνθρώπων** : cp. c. 44 *supra.*

παρῆν τε : the climactic τε, cp. c. 66. 4 *supra.* παρῆν, cp. 8. 20, like παρεόν 6. 137, 7. 24, etc., 'it was in their power . .' The 'many myriads' are immediately precised as 30–4 = 260,000 units, of whom less than 3000 survive ! Such butchery is practically inconceivable. If we accept 3000 as about the number of the survivors, the figures for Mardonios' forces would have to be indefinitely reduced ; but the one extreme is hardly more to be trusted than the other. It is observable that the *corps d'armée* under Artabazos is here again included strictly in the original total of Mardonios' army, consistently with 8. 126 ; but this involves Hdt. in an inconsistency, for he here seems to take no account of the fact that Artabazos had started with 60,000. He also seems to allow nothing for the losses in previous skirmishes. Hdt.'s statement is tantamount to saying that 99 per cent were slain, for of (300,000–40,000) only (3000–*x*) escaped. The estimate might be rationalized down to meaning that of the 300,000 men, taken by Hdt. as the estimate of the forces left with Mardonios, and still acceptable as an estimate for the total land-forces of Xerxes (τοὺς Ξέρξεω c. 69 *supra*), only 43,000 returned to Asia from the campaign of 479 B.C. If that was less than half the forces entrusted to Mardonios and Artabazos the losses would still have been enormous, and might justify Aischylos and his 'heaps of corpses' (θῖνες δὲ νεκρῶν *Pers.* 821 ff.). Diodoros 11. 32 puts the Persian losses in the battle of Plataia at upwards of 100,000 (probably only Ephoros' rationalism) ; Ktesias 26 the Persian losses from Salamis to Plataia at 120,000.

τριήκοντα μυριάδων στρατοῦ, καταδεουσέων τεσσέρων τὰς ἔχων Ἀρτάβαζος ἔφευγε, τῶν λοιπέων μηδὲ τρεῖς χιλιάδας περιγενέσθαι. Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ τῶν ἐκ Σπάρτης ἀπέθανον οἱ πάντες ἐν τῇ συμβολῇ εἷς καὶ ἐνενήκοντα, Τεγεητέων δὲ ἑκκαίδεκα, Ἀθηναίων δὲ δύο καὶ πεντήκοντα.

Ἠρίστευσε δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων πεζὸς μὲν ὁ Περσέων, ἵππος 71

---

22 μυριαδέων C Marc. 23 ἔφυγε Marc. 25 συμβουλῆι C || καὶ om. **B**

The one tolerably certain fact in the whole story is the escape of Artabazos with not less than 40,000 men.

24. **Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ τῶν ἐκ Σπάρτης**: a remarkable periphrasis for Σπαρτιητέων. No account is taken apparently of the Perioikoi, much less of mere Helots; cp. c. 85 *infra*. The figures which follow have a precise and an authentic air, but apparently refer merely to those who fell in the final and decisive engagement (ἐν τῇ συμβολῇ) of the thirteenth day. In c. 61 *supra* πολλοί have been killed, and in c. 63 the Persians κατέβαλλον πολλοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων—here only 91 'Spartiates' are accounted for 'in all' (**οἱ πάντες**). The proportionate losses are interesting: the Spartans lose not quite 2 per cent (91 out of 5000); the Tegeatai just over 1 per cent (16 out of 1500); the Athenians considerably under 1 per cent (52 out of 8000); the totals, however, are only nominal, especially for the last engagement. No account at all is taken of the right and left centre, to say nothing of the ψιλοί, such as they were. Plutarch (*Aristeid.* 19) gives the sum total (οἱ πάντες) of those who fell upon this occasion as 1360, whereas the figures here amount to 159 only. Plutarch adds, on the authority of Kleidemos, the curious statement that the 52 Athenians were all of one tribe, the Aiantis. If 52 Athenians of one tribe had been slain, we might have to multiply roughly by ten to reach the sum total, though one or other tribe of course might have been specially hard hit on the occasion. At Marathon 192 Athenians were admitted to have fallen (6. 117), considerably more than the total loss here reported for Plataia. There is something radically wrong in these figures, though doubtless they repose on some monuments, or inscriptions, carelessly copied, or misunderstood.

71. 1. **ἠρίστευσε δέ κτλ.** There should follow here the record of the formal ἀριστήια, or awards of valour; as in 8. 11, 17 for Artemision, in 8. 93, 123 for Salamis etc., and in c. 105 *infra* for Mykale. But the record here is not of any formal and express award, for (*a*) the merits of the barbarians are included (cp. however 8. 17); (*b*) Hdt. himself expressly indicates that he has no official authority for his awards. There is in fact here a *casus omissus*, which generates a problem, for assuredly Greeks failed not in the case of Plataia to discuss and award the *Aristeia*, as for the other battles of the war; nor is it credible that Hdt. should unwittingly have passed over the record, or tradition, of the formal award: he must have omitted it deliberately. Plutarch (*Aristeid.* 20 and *de malign. Hdti* 42, 10 = *Mor.* 873) makes good the omission. The Athenians and Spartans nearly came to blows over the question of the award (τὸ ἀριστεῖον): the question was referred to the confederates. Theogeiton of Megara suggested the award of the prize to some third city, Kleokritos of Korinth proposed that Plataia should be that city, Aristeides at once accepted the suggestion on behalf of Athens, and Pausanias on behalf of Lakedaimon. Eighty talents were assigned to the Plataians, out of which they built the temple of Athene, which was still up-standing in the days of Plutarch (cp. note to c. 70 *supra*): the Lakedaimonians, however, erected a trophy on their own account, and the Athenians one likewise separately. This story has intrinsic probability, and the chief argument against it is the silence of Hdt. here, and the silence of Thucydides in the Plataian Apology, 3. 53–59. But the *argumentum e silentio* seldom is conclusive. The story in question was little to the credit either of Sparta or of Athens, and was probably a sore subject at both places. The Athenian Thucydides may have ignored it from patriotism, or

δὲ ἡ Σακέων, ἀνὴρ δὲ λέγεται Μαρδόνιος· Ἑλλήνων δέ, ἀγαθῶν γενομένων καὶ Τεγεητέων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ὑπερεβάλοντο ἀρετῇ Λακεδαιμόνιοι. ἄλλῳ μὲν οὐδενὶ ἔχω ἀποσημήνασθαι (ἅπαντες γὰρ οὗτοι τοὺς κατ' ἑωυτοὺς ἐνίκων), ὅτι δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρότερον προσηνείχθησαν καὶ τούτων ἐκράτησαν. καὶ ἄριστος ἐγένετο μακρῷ Ἀριστόδημος κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας, ὃς ἐκ Θερμοπυλέων μοῦνος τῶν τριηκοσίων σωθεὶς εἶχε ὄνειδός <τε> καὶ ἀτιμίην. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἠρίστευσαν Ποσειδώνιός

71. 2 ἡ: ὁ **B** || λέγεται del. Cobet, van H. 3 ὑπερέβαλον Marc. 4 <τὸ> ἄλλῳ? van H. 5 πάντες **B** 6 ἰσχυρότατον **B**Pz, Holder || προσηνέχθησαν B || τουτέων z 8 ἔχε z 9 <τε> καὶ coni. Stein[1 2], recep. van H., Stein[3] || τούτων **a**

made his dramatic mouthpiece ignore it from fact. It is harder to explain the silence or the ignorance of Hdt.: he takes part definitely with the Lakedaimonians: has he deliberately suppressed the story in the Lakedaimonian interest? It does not help us in this connexion to infer (with Grote and Rawlinson) that no formal decision was made; their inference eases the Thucydidean problem, but not the Herodotean: our author was bound to have told the story of the dispute, even if there was no formal award. He prefers to divide the honours of the day between the Koryphaioi (6. 98), for Plataia to Lakedaimon, for Mykale to Athens. Pindar, *Pyth.* 1. 77, hints that Plataia was a Spartan victory; Aischylos, *Pers.* 816 f., might seem to recognize the claims of the Δωρὶς λόγχη, and Diodoros 11. 33. 1 records a definite award to Sparta and to Pausanias (cp. c. 64 *supra*); but Attic prejudice is most fully represented in the *Menexenos* 240 f. where τὰ ἀριστεῖα τῷ λόγῳ are awarded to the Μαραθωνομάχαι, τὰ δευτερεῖα to τοῖς περὶ Σαλαμῖνα καὶ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχήσασι, while τὸ ἐν Πλαταιαῖς ἔργον, κοινὸν ἤδη τοῦτο Λακεδαιμονίων τε καὶ Ἀθηναίων, holds but the third place, and of the respective credit of the two states the speaker is discreetly silent. This may represent an early, the earliest, Attic tendency. Nothing other states might do should ever be admitted to have eclipsed 'the trophies of Miltiades'! The legend of Marathon had ten years' start of the story of Plataia, and doubtless received a strong stimulus from the idealized 'victory of Pausanias' (cp. c. 27 *supra*).

ὁ Περσέων: i.e. the Persian infantry, as distinguished from Medes, Baktrians, Indians, Sakans, which was directly opposed to the Spartans; cc. 31, 47, 59 *supra*.

2. **ἡ Σακέων**: the *Sakai* or Scyths (cp. 7. 64) oddly enough are not enumerated among the nations furnishing cavalry to the army of Xerxes, 7. 84–86, unless they are masquerading there as Κάσπιοι.

ἀνὴρ δέ: the word here in pregnant sense. **λέγεται** looks a little superfluous, but perhaps is intended to insinuate a doubt; in any case the λόγος must be a Greek one.

3. **ὑπερεβάλοντο ἀρετῇ Λακεδαιμόνιοι.** This is a very definite award by the historian himself, as against the Athenians and Tegeatai, and *a fortiori* against all the rest. ὑπερβάλλεσθαι, cp. 8. 123. The award further stultifies the story told c. 46 *supra*, and the reason given for the award confirms the importance of the ἐθελοκακία on the part of the medizing Greeks admitted in c. 67 *supra*. The *asyndeton* in giving the reason makes it look almost like an argument inserted to answer a challenge or criticism: the **ὅτι δέ** (sc. πλὴν ὅτι, or τῷδε δέ, ὅτι) in apposition to **ἄλλῳ μέν** is observable.

6. **προσφέρεσθαι** is primarily of attacking, cp. c. 49 *supra*.

τούτων: sc. τοῦ ἰσχυροτέρου, i.e. τῶν Περσέων.

7. **ἐγένετο**, 'proved himself': this is the historian's own private judgement (**κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας**, cp. 4. 53) in opposition to Spartan opinion. The absence of a cross reference back to 7. 232, and the full and sufficient description of Aristodemos here, are observable: **ὃς** ἐκ . . ἀτιμίην is rather gloss-like; cp. *l.c.*

9. **Ποσειδώνιός τε καὶ Φιλοκύων**:

τε καὶ Φιλοκύων καὶ Ἀμομφάρετος ὁ Σπαρτιήτης. καίτοι γενομένης λέσχης ὃς γένοιτο αὐτῶν ἄριστος, ἔγνωσαν οἱ παραγενόμενοι Σπαρτιητέων Ἀριστόδημον μὲν βουλόμενον φανερῶς ἀποθανεῖν ἐκ τῆς παρεούσης οἱ αἰτίης, λυσσῶντά τε καὶ ἐκλείποντα τὴν τάξιν ἔργα ἀποδέξασθαι μεγάλα, Ποσειδώνιον δὲ οὐ βουλόμενον ἀποθνήσκειν ἄνδρα γενέσθαι ἀγαθόν· τοσούτῳ τοῦτον εἶναι ἀμείνω. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ φθόνῳ ἂν

---

10 ὁ σπαρτιήτης **a**C : σπαρτιήτης ceteri : Σπαρτιῆται Krueger, Holder : 'an fuit ὁ Πιτανήτης?' Stein : seclusit van H. 11 αὐτέων *z* 12 μὲν : δὲ Marc. 13 αἰτίης : ἀτιμίης Cobet, van H. (tacite) 14 ἐκλιπόντα **B**, Holder, van H. || μεγάλα ἀποδέξασθαι **B** 16 ἀμείνωι R

---

there was not much to choose apparently between this pair; they are mentioned again c. 85 *infra*. The men to whom the ἀριστήια are awarded had all fallen in the fight. The addition of ὁ Σπαρτιήτης to the name of Amompharetos might suggest that Poseidonios and Philokyon were not 'Spartiatai,' but Perioikoi: did Hdt. himself, indeed, write ὁ Σπαρτιήτης? It seems unlikely that the Spartans, even in a *Lesche*, would put Perioikoi above citizens in honour: the burial arrangements, rightly understood, point the same conclusion; cp. c. 85 *infra*. This Poseidonios is not elsewhere mentioned: Poseidon was worshipped in Sparta and throughout Lakonia; cp. S. Wide, *Lakonische Kulte*, 1893, pp. 31–47. Philokyon also as an historical person is otherwise unknown; the name is significant of sporting tendencies, in favour at Sparta.

10. **Ἀμομφάρετος †ὁ Σπαρτιήτης.** On Amompharetos cp. cc. 53 *supra*, 85 *infra*. Hdt. can hardly have written ὁ Σπαρτιήτης here; cp. App. Crit.

11. **γενομένης λέσχης,** 'on the occurrence of a discussion.' λέσχη is hardly official, or authoritative, but rather informal discussion; cp. 2. 32, and ἔλλεσχος 1. 153, περιλεσχήνευτος 2. 135. Blakesley's note *ad l.* is worth consulting, but he seems guilty of an *hysteroproteron* in deriving the idea of the conversation or the meeting from the place of resort, the 'seat in a warm situation,' which was no doubt the scene of many a λέσχη. *Od.* 18. 329 has the word in the locative sense, and the local or material sense is predominant in Attic and Delphic usage (Pausan. 10. 25), but it is hardly possible that location is the primary sense of a derivative of λέγω, and that 'assembly,' 'conversation,' 'talk,' are only secondary, and a function of the place.

ὃς appears to be used for τίς or ὅστις, cp. τὸ χρεὸν εἴη c. 55 *supra*, and 6. 37 τὸ θέλει τὸ ἔπος εἶναι, 6. 124 ὃς μέντοι ἦν ὁ ἀναδέξας κτλ.

αὐτῶν may refer to the three men above named.

οἱ παραγενόμενοι: those present, i.e. (who had been) present (at the battle)? Or, (who were) present (at the discussion)? The former meaning is compatible with the latter fact. Was Hdt. himself present? And where did the discussion take place?

13. **ἐκ τῆς παρεούσης οἱ αἰτίης,** 'in consequence of the blame attaching to him.' ὁ τρέσας apparently had been allowed to resume his place in the ranks; or was Aristodemos at Plataia *extra ordinem*? Had he any choice but ἐκλείπειν τὴν τάξιν? **λυσσᾶν** is rare; cp. Plato, *Rep.* 329 C, 586 C, of ἔρως: here used in its earlier Homeric sense of battle-rage (only in *Iliad*). With his desperate courage may be compared that of his fellows at Thermopylai 7. 223 παραχρεώμενοί τε καὶ ἀτέοντες. Philokyon and Amompharetos are apparently nowhere beside him.

16. **ταῦτα μὲν καὶ φθόνῳ ἂν εἴποιεν.** Was Aristodemos Hdt.'s own hero? Was it the Halikarnassian himself who put in a plea at the discussion for the due recognition of his heroism, was worsted in the argument, and now explains away his own defeat by ascribing φθόνος (*inter alia*) to the other speakers? φθόνος is no doubt a *vera causa* in Greek life and literature (cp. 7. 237), but it is not always rightly invoked, nor does it appear self-evident why Spartiates should be more jealous of Aristodemos than of the others.

εἴποιεν· οὗτοι δὲ τοὺς κατέλεξα πάντες, πλὴν Ἀριστοδήμου, τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ τίμιοι ἐγένοντο· Ἀριστόδημος δὲ βουλόμενος ἀποθανεῖν διὰ τὴν προειρημένην αἰτίην οὐκ ἐτιμήθη.

72 *Οὗτοι μὲν τῶν ἐν Πλαταιῇσι ὀνομαστότατοι ἐγένοντο. Καλλικράτης γὰρ ἔξω τῆς μάχης ἀπέθανε, ἐλθὼν ἀνὴρ κάλλιστος ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν τότε Ἑλλήνων, οὐ μοῦνον αὐτῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων· ὅς, ἐπειδὴ ἐσφαγιάζετο Παυσανίης, κατήμενος ἐν τῇ τάξι ἐτρω-*

17 *εἴποιμεν* **a**C Marc. || *πάντες* **B** : *πάντας* 18 *τῶν ἀποθανόντων . . ἐν Πλαταιῇσι* ut glossema tollenda suad. Krueger : mihi quidem verba *βουλόμενος ἀποθανεῖν* vix genuina videntur 72. 1 *πλαταίηισι* **a** : *πλαταίησιν* **B** 3 *τότε* om. Marc. || *οὐ . . Ἑλλήνων* om. B || *μόνων* RSVcorr. : *μόνον* Vpr. *z* 4 *αὐτέων* *z* || *Ἑλλήνων* del. Gomperz, van H. 5 *τάξι* P*z* : *τάξει*

Probably the Spartiates put aside the case of Aristodemos altogether; with them the only candidates for honours were the others: Poseidonios, Philokyon, Amompharetos. Hdt. has not made this quite clear, his own *γνῶμαι* running counter.

17. **τοὺς κατέλεξα**: a reference back to the immediate context, cp. 7. 99.

18. Krueger suspected the words **τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ** as a gloss on the words *τῶν ἐν Πλαταιῇσι* below: cp. App. Crit.

τίμιοι ἐγένοντο were made 'honourables,' were 'ennobled' or given titles: a strictly official act, or process of glorification, canonization, but only perhaps performed for the departed, and involving (1) a public funeral, (2) a monument, (3) offerings at the tomb *ὥσπερ ἥρωι*. (So too Stein, who cps. 3. 55, which is hardly to the point, and 5. 67.) A lower form of the same act, or process, was the *ἐπαίνεσις*, which was conferred upon the living; cp. Thuc. 2. 25. 2 *πρῶτος τῶν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἐπῃνέθη ἐν Σπάρτῃ* (sc. *ὁ Βρασίδας*).

19. **διὰ τὴν προειρημένην αἰτίην**: i.e. for the aforesaid reason, for the reason I have given; *αἰτίη* being used in a somewhat different sense to that above, *ἐκ τῆς παρεούσης οἱ αἰτίης*. **βουλόμενος ἀποθανεῖν** is like a gloss, and would be on Hdt.'s part an admission weakening his own verdict.

72. 1. **ὀνομαστότατοι**: in the positive 8. 89, 6. 114; in the comparative 6. 126. **τῶν ἐν Πλαταιῇσι** seems = *τῶν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ ἀποθανόντων*: cp. note above.

2. **Καλλικράτης γάρ** gives the reason for his not being one of the *ὀνομαστότατοι*—he died, perforce, a passive death, **ἔξω τῆς μάχης**, without having been able to strike a blow. It seems a restricted idea of the *μάχη* which regards Kallistratos as *hors du combat*; yet he was not actually slain in the ranks but apparently carried to the rear, and he was unable to strike a blow *cominus*: the passive virtues, and even the passive states of active virtues (e.g. courage) were less highly esteemed in Sparta than with us. The name Kallikrates is not an uncommon one. Plutarch, *Agesilaos* 35, mentions a Spartan of his own time so named, a descendant of the man, Antikrates, who had dealt Epameinondas his death-blow. Who would not fain believe that Kallikratidas, the typical Spartan of the old school (Xenophon, *Hell.* 1. 6. 1–36) towards the end of the fifth century, was a relative of the Plataian hero, who was remembered for his good looks and his last *bon mot*?

3. **κάλλιστος . . τῶν τότε Ἑλλήνων**: like Nireus to Ilion, *Il.* 2. 673; like Philippos of Kroton to Segesta, 5. 47. Size was an element in the Hellenic conception of *κάλλος*, whether male or female (cp. 3. 1 *κάρτα μεγάλη τε καὶ εὐειδής*, 5. 12 *μεγάλην τε καὶ εὐειδέα*, 1. 60 Phye); cp. the description of Xerxes 7. 187, *κάλλεός τε εἵνεκα καὶ μεγάθεος*. Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 17, specifies the size as well as the beauty of Kallikrates.

5. **ἐπειδὴ ἐσφαγιάζετο Παυσανίης**: cp. c. 61 *supra*; *ἐπεί* is used with the

ματίσθη τοξεύματι τὰ πλευρά. καὶ δὴ οἱ μὲν ἐμάχοντο, ὁ δ' ἐξενηνειγμένος ἐδυσθανάτεέ τε καὶ ἔλεγε πρὸς Ἀείμνηστον ἄνδρα Πλαταιέα οὐ μέλειν οἱ ὅτι πρὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀποθνήσκει, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἐχρήσατο τῇ χειρὶ καὶ ὅτι οὐδέν ἐστί οἱ ἀποδεδεγμένον ἔργον ἑωυτοῦ ἄξιον προθυμευμένου ἀποδέξασθαι.

Ἀθηναίων δὲ λέγεται εὐδοκιμῆσαι Σωφάνης ὁ Εὐτυχίδεω, **73**

---

6 ὁ δὲ **ß** 7 *ἐξεινηνεγμένος* z || *τε* om. **ß** || *ἀείμνηστον* SVz: *ἀρίμνηστον* ceteri, Stein, Holder, van H., cf. c. 64 supra 8 *μέλλειν* B**ß** Marc. || *ἀποθνῄσκει* van H., Stein[3]: *ἀποθνήσκει* (*ἀποθνήσκειν* C) 9 *χερὶ* z

---

imperf. c. 56 *supra*. The verb is a 'deponent' (L. & S.), but why not 'middle,' as *σφαγιάζω* is found in Aristophanes (*bis*) *Birds* 569 f. (*σφαγιαζομένῳ* passive) and in later writers (cp. *σφαγιασθέντι* 7. 180 *supra*)?

κατήμενος ἐν τῇ τάξι. The hoplites sat on the ground in the battle-array, crouching under their shields, to avoid the arrows and other missiles, cp. cc. 61, 62 (especially *προεξαναστάντες*). Wesseling refers to Plutarch *Aristeid.* 17 *ὡς δὲ θυόμενος οὐκ ἐκαλλιέρει προσέταξε τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις τὰς ἀσπίδας πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν θεμένους ἀτρέμα καθέζεσθαι.* The idea that the shields were put out of use for the time is hardly to be entertained. The passages quoted from Euripides, *Suppl.* 357, 664, 674 (*παρ' ὅπλοις ἧσθαι, ἐφ' ὅπλοις ἧσθαι,* or *ἧσθαι simpliciter*), are not really to the point, as they do not describe a tactical position. More to the point were Tyrtaios, 11. 35 (*ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος πτώσσοντες*), but that it applies only to *γυμνῆτες*, cp. c. 48 *supra*.

6. **τὰ πλευρά**: cp. c. 22 *supra*, an accusative 'of reference' or limitation; a plural of extent or abstraction (it takes a plurality of ribs to make one side). On which side he was wounded Hdt. does not say; probably the right.

ἐμάχοντο: the *μάχη* is in progress, though Kallikrates dies *ἔξω τῆς μάχης*, having been carried to the rear; or perhaps the imperfect is used to denote their ability and mind for battle, as compared with his disqualification. **καὶ δή**, concessive, cp. cc. 6, 8, 48 *supra*.

7. **ἐξενηνειγμένος**: he was carried out of the ranks by his helot, with or without assistance; cp. the narrative of the destruction of the Spartan *mora* in 390 B.C., Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 5. 14 *οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐπεὶ ἠκοντίζοντο καὶ ὁ μέν τις ἐτέτρωτο ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐπεπτώκει, τούτους μὲν ἐκέλευον τοὺς ὑπασπιστὰς ἀραμένους ἀποφέρειν εἰς Λέχαιον· καὶ οὗτοι μόνοι τῆς μόρας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐσώθησαν* (*ὑπασπισταί*, i.e. *γυμνῆτες*, i.e. helots).

ἐδυσθανάτεε, 'was dying hard,' i.e. kept death at bay for some time; cp. Plato *Rep.* 406 B *δυσθανατῶν δὲ ὑπὸ σοφίας εἰς γῆρας ἀφίκετο* (anticipated just before in *μακρὸν τὸν θάνατον αὑτῷ ποιήσας*). How long the struggle lasted in the case of Kallikrates is not stated.

Ἀείμνηστον ἄνδρα Πλαταιέα. This can hardly be any other than the *ἀνὴρ ἐν Σπάρτῃ λόγιμος* who had the credit of dealing Mardonios his death-wound, cp. c. 64 *supra*, perhaps one with *ὁ στρατηγὸς τῶν Πλαταιέων* of Plutarch *Aristeid.* 11. How the dying Kallikrates comes to be conversing with him *ἔξω τῆς μάχης* is not very clear. Were there Plataians attached to the staff of Pausanias, or working with the Spartans (as well as those with the Athenians); or had the Plataians been shifted wholesale to the right wing; or did the interview between Aeimnestos and the dying man take place after the battle?

8. **πρό**, 'on behalf of . .' = *ἕνεκα, ὑπέρ*. Cp. c. 22 *supra*.

9. **οὐκ ἐχρήσατο τῇ χειρί**: cp. 3. 78 *ὁρέων δέ μιν ἀργὸν ἐπεστεῶτα ὁ Γοβρύης εἴρετο ὅ τι οὐ χρᾶται τῇ χειρί.*

73. 1. **Ἀθηναίων δέ.** The interest is shifted to the left wing, of which very little has been recorded in the actual battle, cp. cc. (60), 61, 67, (70). A different source is doubtless here in evidence, though the introduction of the verb **λέγεται** is not reassuring as to its reliability. **εὐδοκιμῆσαι** is, of course, less than *ἀριστεῦσαι*, which is used of the same man in the next chapter.

Σωφάνης ὁ Εὐτυχίδεω: an old

ἐκ δήμου Δεκελεῆθεν, Δεκελέων δὲ τῶν κοτε ἐργασαμένων ἔργον χρήσιμον ἐς τὸν πάντα χρόνον, ὡς αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι. ὡς γὰρ δὴ τὸ πάλαι κατὰ Ἑλένης κομιδὴν Τυνδαρίδαι

73. 2 ἐκ : ἐὼν Koen, Holder, van H. || δεκελῆθεν BP Marc. z : δὲ κεκλῆθεν C || κοτὲ Bekker : ποτε libri 4 τοπάλαι Pz

acquaintance, as the work of Hdt. now stands; cp. 6. 92, where his deme but not his patronymic is given; cp. further c. 75 *infra*, where his biography is enlarged. The father's name, Eutychides, is commoner at Athens and elsewhere than the son's (cp. Pape-Benseler, *sub vv.*), but nothing more appears to be recorded of this particular man. Greek onomatology rang a score of changes on the significant compounds εὐ-τυχ-. The wish was father to the name.

2. **ἐκ δήμου Δεκελεῆθεν.** The first two words were superfluous in official Attic. The *demotikon* is given as Δεκελεύς here and in 6. 92. Δεκελειεύς *ap.* Steph. B. *sub v.*, also Δεκελειᾶθεν and Δεκελειόθεν. On the position of Dekeleia cp. c. 15 *supra*. It belonged to the (VIII) Hippothontis (cp. *l.c.*) and was perhaps the chief deme in the Mesogaian or Land-Trittys of that tribe, though this point does not appear to have been as yet established epigraphically (cp. Judeich *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa ii. 2229 f.; Milchhöfer, *ib.* iv. 2425).

Δεκελέων δὲ τῶν κοτε κτλ. The genitive may be in rough apposition to Δεκελεῆθεν or to δήμου, or constructed with Σωφάνης, or even regarded as a correction or limitation of Ἀθηναίων, or, in fine, of no very strict construction at all! The digression or excursus into the mythical history of Attica is rather forced, and looks like an insertion, but how far the insertion extends is not obvious. Insertions may even have been made here at more than one time; thus the last sentence of the chapter (**οὕτω ὥστε . . ἀπέχεσθαι**) is manifestly to be dated after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, but may be a separate addition. There are, in fact, traces in this passage of all three drafts, or stages, in the composition of Hdt.'s work, viz. the original basis, which would naturally record the ἀριστήια on the Athenian side; the addition of a note on the mythical antecedents of Dekeleia; thirdly, the little appendix upon the sparing of Dekeleia by the Spartans. The first would belong to the earliest draft; the second might have resulted from Hdt.'s first visit to Athens; the third is plainly an addition to be dated after 431 B.C. Cp. Introduction, § 9.

3. **ἐς τὸν πάντα χρόνον**, 'for ever,' 'to all time'; contrast c. 13. 6 *supra*.

ὡς αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, 'as even Athenian (writers) themselves admit.' The mythic origins of the privileges enjoyed by the Dekeleians at Sparta had doubtless been made the subject of research and investigation by native writers before Hdt. penned this passage; cp. Introduction, § 10.

4. **τὸ πάλαι** here goes back to a time before the Trojan war.

κατὰ Ἑλένης κομιδὴν: *ad recuperandam Helenam*, Baehr. Helene is, of course, Homeric Helen, Ἀργείη Ἑλένη *Il.* 2. 161, sister of Kastor and Polydeukes, *Il.* 3. 237 f., daughter of Tyndareus and Leda, *Od.* 11. 299 ff., unless indeed Zeus himself was her sire, *Od.* 4. 219, 227, cp. 569. The adventure here involved is not recorded in Homer, but it was perhaps represented on the Chest of Kypselos (Pausan. 5. 19. 3, Dio Chrysost. *Or.* 11. 325 R, Dindorf-Teubner i. 179), and was familiar to the Lyric poets; cp. Alkman, Fr. 13 = Pausan. 1. 41. 4, Stesichoros 27 = Pausan. 2. 22. 6, Pindar, Fr. 258 = Pausan. 1. 41. 5; and the story is told by Diodor. 4. 63, Plutarch, *Thes.* 31–34, Pausan. 1. 17. 5 (in part). Theseus and Peirithous stole Helena, a lovely girl of ten years, as she danced before the altar of Artemis Orthia in Sparta; they drew lots for her, Theseus won, and put her for safety in Aphidna with his mother Aithra. During his absence (to help Peirithous to carry off Persephone!) the sons of Tyndareus invaded Attica, and recovered their sister. Aithra was carried off by them into captivity, which may account for her figuring as attendant on Helena in the *Iliad*.

Τυνδαρίδαι. This patronymic does not occur in *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, but makes its appearance (like Διὸς κοῦροι) in the *Hymns*, e.g. 17, 33. (Does the name

ἐσέβαλον ἐς γῆν τὴν Ἀττικὴν σὺν στρατοῦ πλήθεϊ καὶ ἀνίστασαν τοὺς δήμους, οὐκ εἰδότες ἵνα ὑπεξέκειτο ἡ Ἑλένη, τότε λέγουσι τοὺς Δεκελέας, οἳ δὲ αὐτὸν Δέκελον ἀχθόμενόν τε τῇ Θησέος ὕβρι καὶ δειμαίνοντα περὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἀθηναίων χώρῃ, ἐξηγησάμενόν σφι τὸ πᾶν πρῆγμα κατηγήσασθαι ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀφίδνας, τὰς δὴ Τιτακὸς ἐὼν αὐτόχθων καταπροδιδοῖ

5 *πλήθει* AB 6 *ἡ* om. C 7 *καὶ τοὺς* z || *δεκελεὸν* **B** 8 *ὕβρει* C Marc. || *δημαίνοντα* C 10 *ἀφνίδας* **B** || *τὰς δή τοι κακὸς* Marc.

contain that conjunction of *-νδ-*, the supposed minor-Asiatic equivalent for -nt-, -nth-, Kretschmer, 293 ff.? (L. & S. appear to connect it with (Lat.) *tund-o* etc.).)

5. **ἀνίστασαν τοὺς δήμους**, 'were upsetting, depopulating, ravaging, the demes.' There is no material anachronism in the assumption that the *Demoi* were in existence in the days of Theseus, for the *Demoi* are the oldest institutions in historic Attica; yet the phraseology here, as elsewhere in Hdt. (cp. 1. 60 *bis*), is rather post-Kleisthenean (cp. 5. 69) than 'Theseian.' Theseus, indeed, was already accounted the author of the Attic *synoikismos* (cp. Thuc. 2. 15), but Thucydides is careful to represent the Thesean synoikism as a purely political centralization, the units in which had been themselves *πόλεις*. Diodoros *l.c.* has *τῶν δὲ Ἀθηναίων ἀγανακτούντων ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι φοβηθεὶς ὁ Θησεὺς ὑπεξέθετο τὴν Ἑλένην εἰς Ἄφιδναν, μίαν τῶν Ἀττικῶν πόλεων*. (That the description may not square with the hypothetical synoikism need not distress us.)

6. **ἵνα**, *ubi*: cp. Index.

7. **τότε** is, of course, 'at the date of Theseus.'

λέγουσι . . οἳ δέ shows that there were already conflicting variants on the tradition; an extreme illustration is supplied by Plutarch (*Thes.* 32) who substitutes *Ἀκάδημος* and the *Ἀκαδήμεια* for *Δέκελος* and *Δεκέλεια*. *Δέκελος* is, of course, the eponymous hero of the deme. Stein connects his name with *δεικνύναι* *indicare*, *index*. and sees in this etymology the origin of the rôle played by *Δέκελος* or the *Δεκελεῖς*.

8. **τῇ Θησέος ὕβρι**: primarily the adventure with Peirithous itself; cp. the passage cited from Diodoros above; in the second place, perhaps more generally the high-handed tyranny of Theseus, his attack on local liberties, and so on. The phrase is hardly of Attic origin, and perhaps betrays Hdt.'s Anti-Ionism (cp. *Hdt. IV.–VI.* ii. 214). In the version followed by Plutarch the Tyndaridai are working in the interests of Menestheus, the earliest demagogue on record (c. 32). So too in Pausanias 1. 17. 5 *στρατεύουσιν ἐς Ἄφιδναν οἱ Τυνδάρεω παῖδες, καὶ τήν τε Ἄφιδναν αἱροῦσι καὶ Μενεσθέα ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ κατήγαγον.*

δειμαίνοντα περὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἀθηναίων χώρῃ: this solicitude on the part of the local leader, or hero, for 'the whole Athenian land' presupposes the unification of Attica, or at least a synoikism on a large scale, and a solidarity of interests; but the variant cited above from Pausanias might suggest that what Dekelos really wished to avoid was being subjected to Menestheus and the central power! In reality Dekelos here plays the chief rôle, and the political turn given to the legend there is probably afterthought. **περί** with *dat.* causal, especially common with verbs denoting fear, courage, hope, etc.

9. **ἐξηγησάμενόν σφι . . κατηγήσασθαι.** Hdt. is not over-careful to avoid such stylistic incongruities; cp. Index *s.v.* Iterations.

10. **τὰς Ἀφίδνας.** Strabo 397 gives *Ἄφιδνα (λέγουσι δὲ καὶ πληθυντικῶς Ἀφίδνας)* as one of the twelve original city-states of Attica, on the authority of Philochoros. Steph. Byz. makes Aphidna a deme of the Leontis, apparently a slip for Aiantis (cp. Milchhoefer *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa i. 2719), and mentions the suggestive fact that there was an Aphidna in Lakonia. The position of the Attic deme is identified on and round Kotroni, in the neighbourhood of Marathon; but Aphidna probably belonged to the Mesogaian Trittys of the Aiantis, and may have given its name thereto; it was one of the largest and most important demes in Attica (cp. Milchhoefer, *Demenordnung*, 1892, p. 8) and was fortified in the time of

Τυνδαρίδῃσι. τοῖσι δὲ Δεκελεῦσι ἐν Σπάρτῃ ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ
ἔργου ἀτελείη τε καὶ προεδρίη διατελέει ἐς τόδε αἰεὶ ἔτι
ἐοῦσα, οὕτω ὥστε καὶ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον τὸν ὕστερον πολλοῖσι
ἔτεσι τούτων γενόμενον Ἀθηναίοισί τε καὶ Πελοποννησίοισι,
σινομένων τὴν ἄλλην Ἀττικὴν Λακεδαιμονίων, Δεκελέης ἀπ-
74 έχεσθαι. τούτου τοῦ δήμου ἐὼν ὁ Σωφάνης καὶ ἀριστεύσας
τότε Ἀθηναίων διξοὺς λόγους λεγομένους ἔχει, τὸν μὲν ὡς ἐκ

11 ἐν Σπάρτῃ post ἔργου *z* 12 προεδρίηι B : προεδρείη Marc. 15 σινεομένων **B** 74. 1 τοῦ om. A[1]

Demosthenes (*de Cor.* 38), and probably from time immemorial. It appears again in Hdt. as the deme of Kallimachos the polemarch at Marathon, 6. 109, and of the insignificant Timodemos, 8. 125.

Τιτακός is unmistakably the eponymous hero of the neighbouring deme Τιτακίδαι, and in this story of his betrayal of Aphidnai Milchhoefer (*Demenordnung* p. 34) sees indications (1) of local jealousies, (2) of the former inclusion of Titakidai in Aphidnai. The little deme, together with Thyrgonidai and Perrhidai (all members of the Aphidna-Trittys), may have occupied the modern villages of *Kapandriti*, *Masi* and *Tsiurka*.

11. **τοῖσι δὲ Δεκελεῦσι ἐν Σπάρτῃ**: doubtless the Dekeleians really held privileges in Sparta, which had originated in legendary days, before the coming of the Dorians, and were continuously maintained, though perhaps not very often exercised, in historic Sparta. **ἀπό**, 'from the date of . .,' rather temporal than causal.

12. **ἀτελείη τε καὶ προεδρίη**: two privileges frequently combined (cp. 1. 54); the former term denotes financial, economic, freedom from taxation, dues, etc., which might be complete or partial (cp. 3. 67); the latter term denotes precedence (front seat) at public festivals, games, etc.; cp. L. & S. *sub vv.* (The latter could only be a personal privilege, conferred upon individuals or communities; the former might be attached to property, irrespective of the particular owner; cp. the *ἀτελὲς χωρίον* on Hymettos, *Ἀθην. πολ.* 16. 6.) Demosthenes, *Lept.* 105, says that the Lakedaimonians (and Thebans) *οὐδενὶ τῶν παρ' ἑαυτοῖς διδόασι τοιαύτην οὐδεμίαν τιμήν* (sc. *ἀτελείαν*). That is an obvious exaggeration: *ἔστι γὰρ αὐτοῖς νόμος τὸν μὲν γεννήσαντα τρεῖς υἱοὺς ἄφρουρον εἶναι τὸν δὲ τέτταρας ἀτελῆ πάντων*, Aristot. *Pol.* 2. 9. 18 = 1270 B.

ἐς τόδε αἰεὶ ἔτι ἐοῦσα. As the text now stands the date here indicated comes down to the out-break of the war noted in the next following sentence; but, if the latter is an addition, these words may have stood originally as denoting a date fifteen to twenty years earlier. We have here also traces of the stratification in Hdt.'s composition, which explains the appearance of the later, or latest references in the portion earliest drafted; cp. Introduction, § 9, and next note.

13. **οὕτω ὥστε κτλ.** As the privileges of the Dekeleians in Sparta must have been suspended by war, this passage (Stein too observes) would have the air of an addition, while grammatically the **οὕτω** has no proper reference to what precedes. The war here mentioned is plainly the 'ten years' war' which broke out in 431 B.C., and the special favour shown to Dekeleia is hardly less plainly to be dated to the first invasion, in which Archidamos laid waste the Thriasian plain, and all the parts of Attica north of the city, and retired *via* (Dekeleia) Oropos and Boiotia, Thuc. 2. 18–23. **ἐς τὸν πόλεμον** is hardly so clear as *ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ*, or *κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον* (cp. 7. 137) would have been, and is perhaps only a carelessness produced by the proximity of **ἐς τόδε** just before (cp. c. 64 *supra*).

15. **τὴν ἄλλην Ἀττικήν** looks like an exaggeration; the whole of the south of Attica was ravaged in the second invasion, 430 B.C., Thuc. 2. 55, 57.

74. 1. **ἀριστεύσας**: cp. c. 73 *ad init.*

2. **διξοὺς λόγους λεγομένους ἔχει**: sc. ὁ Σωφάνης: for λόγον ἔχειν (to be reported) cp. 5. 66. Stein suggests as the source of these 'Märchen' *Skolia* in honour of the popular *Marathono-*

τοῦ ζωστῆρος τοῦ θώρηκος ἐφόρεε χαλκέῃ ἁλύσι δεδεμένην ἄγκυραν σιδηρέην, τὴν ὅκως πελάσειε ἀπικνεόμενος τοῖσι πολεμίοισι βαλλέσκετο, ἵνα δή μιν οἱ πολέμιοι ἐκπίπτοντες ἐκ τῆς τάξιος μετακινῆσαι μὴ δυναίατο· γινομένης δὲ φυγῆς τῶν ἐναντίων δέδοκτο τὴν ἄγκυραν ἀναλαβόντα οὕτω διώκειν. οὗτος μὲν οὕτω λέγεται, ὁ δ' ἕτερος τῶν λόγων τῷ πρότερον λεχθέντι ἀμφισβατέων λέγεται, ὡς ἐπ' ἀσπίδος αἰεὶ περιθεούσης καὶ οὐδαμὰ ἀτρεμιζούσης ἐφόρεε ἄγκυραν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ θώρηκος δεδεμένην σιδηρέην. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερον Σωφάνεϊ **75**
λαμπρὸν ἔργον ἐξεργασμένον, ὅτι περικατημένων Ἀθηναίων Αἴγιναν Εὐρυβάτην τὸν Ἀργεῖον ἄνδρα πεντάεθλον ἐκ προ-

3 *ἁλύσει* **α**CSV 4 *ἀπικνεομένοισι τοῖσι* V: *ἀπικνεουμένοισι τῆσι* R: *ἀπικνεόμενος <ἐς μάχην> τοῖσι?* Stein(2) 5 *βαλλέσκετο* Pz, Stein[2], van H.: *βαλέσκετο* 6 *κινῆσαι* Marc. 7 *ἐδέδοκτο* **B**, Holder: *ἐδέδοκτό <οἱ>* van H. 8 *οὗτος*: *οὕτω* B ‖ *ὁ δ' . . λέγεται* om. B 9 *ἀμφισβητέων* **B**Pz 10 *οὐδαμᾶ* Rz ‖ *ἐπίσημον ἄγκυραν* **B**, Holder, van H.: *ἄγκυραν εἰκασμένην* sive *μεμιμημένην* (*ἐπίσημον* omisso) coni. Stein[2 3] **75.** 1 *σωφάνει* AB 2 *ἐξειργασμένον* Marc. ‖ *ὅτε* **B**, Krueger, Holder, van H. 3 *εὐρυβάντην* Marc.: *εὐρυβιάδην* **B** ‖ *ἀρεῖον* C ‖ *προβλήσιος* **B**

maches. (It is not expressly recorded that Sophanes was at Marathon, but he may certainly be credited therewith.) Such *Skolia* may have contained expressions or allusions, of which the διξοὶ λόγοι here reported are prosaic interpretations.

(*a*) According to the one, Sophanes used to carry, slung (**δεδεμένην ἐκ**) from the belt of his cuirass on a bronze chain, an iron anchor; this he would throw, when he approached the enemy (and it would, no doubt, stick in the ground), in such a way that the enemy could not make him budge, though they might charge him; then, when the adversaries were put to flight, his plan was to pick up his anchor and so be after them.

This is not a very credible story, and it is contradicted by the other.

(*b*) He had upon his shield an anchor as a device, or emblem; and his shield was in perpetual motion, never at rest. In which case there was a contrast between the man's emblem and his action.

It is possible that the latter and simpler story was at the root of the other, or that some jest on the anchor and its bearer generated the more prosaic and less credible interpretation.

7. **δέδοκτο**: sc. *αὐτῷ*.

οὕτω: i.e. to take up his anchor before attempting to pursue.

9. **ἀμφισβατέων**: cp. the subst. 8. 81.

10. **ἀτρεμιζούσης**: the form *ἀτρεμέειν* 7. 8, 8. 68 *supra*; but *ἀτρεμίζειν* 7. 18. It must have been the man, not his shield, that was so restless. The Karians had the credit of such inventions; cp. 1. 171.

75. 1. **ἔστι δὲ . . ἐξεργασμένον.** The position of *ἔστι* shows that it is not a mere auxiliary, nor is the form of construction merely equivalent to a perfect passive. The **λαμπρὸν ἔργον**, though wrought, and wrought out, in the past, is conceived of as existing in the present: it is for ever.

2. **περικατημένων**, 'blockading': perfect in form, but present, or imperfect, in sense. The verb is used here as in 8. 111 of an island-city, but the operations are in part at least on land.

3. **Εὐρυβάτην τὸν Ἀργεῖον.** The story is told, and that more fully, in 6. 92, though without cross-reference either here or there; the present is probably the elder passage. Had the other been composed first, the further notes on Sophanes would have been there added (unless it were supposed that the passage was composed before his death! Even so, a reference to his anchor might

κλήσιος ἐφόνευσε. αὐτὸν δὲ Σωφάνεα χρόνῳ ὕστερον τούτων κατέλαβε ἄνδρα γενόμενον ἀγαθόν, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγέοντα ἅμα Λεάγρῳ τῷ Γλαύκωνος, ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἠδωνῶν ἐν Δάτῳ περὶ τῶν μετάλλων τῶν χρυσέων μαχόμενον.

4 *τουτέων* z   7 *μαχεόμενον* z : om. **B**

have been expected). Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

πεντάεθλον: cp. c. 33 *supra*.

ἐκ προκλήσιος ἐφόνευσε: cp. 5. 1; i.e. 'he challenged (or answered a challenge) to single combat and slew . .' The fuller story in 6. 92, from the Aiginetan war (487–483 B.C.), reports that Eurybates was Strategos of the 1000 Argive volunteers who fought for Aigina, and that he slew three Athenians in single combat before succumbing to Sophanes, a record which on the one hand enhances, on the other diminishes, the achievement of Sophanes; the Argive pentathlete may have been pretty well done-up before he reached his round with Sophanes.

4. **χρόνῳ ὕστερον τούτων**: i.e. subsequent to the Persian war; cp. c. 73 *supra*; the exact date is not so certain.

5. **κατέλαβε** is impersonal; cp. cc. 93, 104 *infra*.

Ἀθηναίων στρατηγέοντα ἅμα Λεάγρῳ τῷ Γλαύκωνος, 'Leagros son of Glaukon' was no doubt the father of 'Glaukon son of Leagros' (Thuc. 1. 51. 4; cp. *C.I.A.* i. 179, Hicks[2] No. 53), who commanded at Sybota in 432 B.C., as he had previously done in the Samian war, Androtion *Fr.* 44 a. Nearly half a score Athenians of the name of Glaukon can be identified (cp. Pape-Benseler *sub v.*), but nothing more is known of the eldest one here named.

6. **ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἠδώνων ἐν Δάτῳ.** Stein identifies this disaster with the defeat recorded by Thucydides 1. 100. 3 (cp. 4. 102. 2) synchronously with the revolt and blockade of Thasos, and dated by Busolt, III. i. 202, very precisely to the late summer of 465 B.C. Thucydides, however, without mentioning Daton makes Drabeskos the scene of the disaster. Stein suggests that Hdt. has confounded the objective, or goal, of the expedition, viz. Daton, with the scene of the Athenian defeat, viz. Drabeskos, which is to be placed on the road to Datos, or Daton. Drabeskos is, indeed, the less problematic spot geographically; its position is ascertained "on the road from Herakleia Sintica to Philippi" (Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* iii. 1070), or at any rate to the north, and inland from Philippi (cp. mod. *Drama*). If the Athenians were defeated at Drabeskos on their way to Datos, or Daton, they were fetching a considerable compass from Amphipolis and the Strymon. Busolt (*l.c.*, following Henzen) regards Daton, at least in Hdt.'s time, as the name not of a town but of a district (that too seems to be Stein's first idea); the reconciliation between Hdt. and Thuc. in this case being effected by the supposition that Hdt. names the region and Thuc. the exact scene, or the township nearest to the scene, of the disaster. Cp. Strabo 331 (7. fr. 36) *παρὰ δὲ τὴν παραλίαν τοῦ Στρυμόνος καὶ Δατηνῶν πόλις Νεάπολις καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ Δάτον, εὔκαρπα πεδία καὶ λίμνην καὶ ποταμοὺς καὶ ναυπήγια καὶ χρυσεῖα λυσιτελῆ ἔχον, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ παροιμιάζονται Δάτον ἀγαθῶν ὡς καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθίδας.* This passage places the town of Daton on the coast, hard by Neapolis; but though this Neapolis appears on the Attic tribute-lists of the fifth century (*Νεάπολις ἐν Θράκῃ*, N. *παρ' Ἀντισάραν*, *Νεοπολῖται οἱ παρὰ Θάσον*) Daton is never mentioned. Neapolis was, in fact, at that period the port for the district of Datos; the town of Daton was only founded *c.* 360 B.C. by the Thasians, when they took possession of Krenides, under the leadership of the exiled Athenian Kallistratos (Busolt, *op. c.* 197 note 5). The identification of Daton with Krenides, the later Philippi (Appian *B. C.* 4. 105 *οἱ δὲ Φίλιπποι πόλις ἐστὶν ἡ Δάτος ὠνομάζετο πάλαι, καὶ Κρηνῖδες ἔτι πρὸ Δάτου.* So too Harpokration *s.v.* *Δατός* (*sic*) on the authority of Ephoros and Philochoros; cp. Diodor. 16. 3. 7), is hardly reconcilable with Strabo's statement above quoted; but Strabo must give way to Harpokration's authorities; least of all should Datos have been identified with Neapolis (as by Leake, *N.G.* iii. 224). On the Edonians cp. 7. 110.

ἀποθανεῖν ὑπό: cp. c. 37.

7. **περὶ τῶν μετάλλων τῶν χρυσέων.** The whole region was argentiferous

Ὡς δὲ τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἐν Πλαταιῇσι κατέστρωντο οἱ 76 βάρβαροι, ἐνθαῦτά σφι ἐπῆλθε γυνὴ αὐτόμολος· ἣ ἐπειδὴ ἔμαθε ἀπολωλότας τοὺς Πέρσας καὶ νικῶντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἐοῦσα παλλακὴ Φαρανδάτεος τοῦ Τεάσπιος ἀνδρὸς Πέρσεω, κοσμησαμένη χρυσῷ <τε> πολλῷ καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ <αἱ> ἀμφίπολοι καὶ ἐσθῆτι τῇ καλλίστῃ τῶν παρεουσέων, καταβᾶσα ἐκ τῆς ἁρμαμάξης ἐχώρεε ἐς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ἔτι ἐν τῇσι φονῇσι ἐόντας, ὁρῶσα δὲ πάντα ἐκεῖνα διέποντα Παυσανίην, πρότερόν τε τὸ οὔνομα ἐξεπισταμένη καὶ τὴν πάτρην ὥστε πολλάκις ἀκούσασα, ἔγνω τε τὸν Παυσανίην καὶ λαβομένη τῶν γουνά-

---

76. 1 πλαταίῃισι **α**: πλαταίῃσι **β** 4 φαρναδάτεος **β** 5 <τε> Stein[(2) 3], van H. || <αἱ> Reiske, Holder, van H., quod mihi quoque placitum inserui 6 ἐκ τῶν *z* 7 ἀρμαμάξης B || φωνῇσιν Marc. 8 ἐόντας om. **α**C Marc. || ὁρέουσα Stein[1]

---

and auriferous; cp. 7. 112. The mines at Krenides-Philippi were only fully exploited by Philip; cp. Diodor. 16. 8. 6 *τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν χώραν χρύσεια μέταλλα παντελῶς ὄντα λιτὰ καὶ ἄδοξα ταῖς κατασκευαῖς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ηὔξησεν ὥστε δύνασθαι φέρειν αὐτῷ πρόσοδον πλέον ἢ ταλάντων χιλίων.*

76. 1. ἐν Πλαταιῇσι: probably the actual conflict between the Lakedaimonians and Persians took place on the soil of Hysiai (cp. c. 62 *supra*); but (*a*) the Athenians were doubtless fighting on Plataian ground, (*b*) the island position was Plataian ground, (*c*) the 'second position' of the Greeks was on Plataian ground (c. 25 *supra*), (*d*) Plataia was a much more important place than Hysiai or Erythrai, the former of which at least was accounted Attic ground, cp. 5. 74, and perhaps subordinate to Plataia, cp. 6. 108 (but cp. also Plutarch *Aristeid.* 11). Thus, all things considered, the battle and the operations generally seem naturally associated with the name of Plataia, albeit, in the reconstruction of the battle-piece as a whole, Erythrai, Hysiai, Plataia, and their respective territories, have to be carefully distinguished; cp. cc. 15, 19, 25 *supra*.

κατέστρωντο, as in 8. 53; cp. c. 69 *supra*.

3. **νικῶντας**, 'victors'; cp. c. 69 *supra*.

4. **παλλακή**: opposed to *κουριδίη γυνή* 1. 84.

Φαρανδάτεος τοῦ Τεάσπιος. Pharandates had been *ἄρχων*, i.e. myriarch, of the Mares and Kolchoi in the army of Xerxes, 7. 79. He was evidently an Achaimenid (Teaspes), though Hdt. does not expressly say so; and his mother, too, was perhaps a sister of Dareios; cp. 4. 43.

6. **τῶν παρεουσέων**: not to disparage her travelling wardrobe, or to suggest that she had still better at home, but rather to emphasize its splendour.

7. **ἁρμάμαξα**: cp. 7. 41, 8. 83.

ἐχώρεε: on foot.

ἔτι ἐν τῇσι φονῇσι ἐόντας, 'stil engaged on the work of slaughter *φοναί* is Homeric and poetical; the singular is not in use.

8. **διέπειν**: as in 6. 107, 5. 22.

πρότερόν τε . . ἀκούσασα, 'as she was previously well acquainted with his name and country (father-land), having heard them again and again'—her father having been on terms of *ξεινίη* with Pausanias; see just below.

9. **πάτρη**, cp. 6. 126, 'land,' not 'lineage' (as in *Il.* 13. 354, cp. the use in Pindar=*gens*, Rumpel, *Lex. Pind. sub v.*). Hdt. has the more usual form *πατρίς*, 8. 61, for fatherland; he uses *πατριή* for lineage, cp. 3. 75, 2. 143, and the lady addresses Pausanias not as 'son of Kleombrotos' (c. 78. 4), but as king of 'Sparta.' **ὥστε**=*ἅτε*: cp. c. 70 *supra*.

10. **ἔγνω**, without ever having seen him before, from now seeing him in authority. He was probably young; cp. c. 10 *supra*.

λαβομένη τῶν γουνάτων: as a *ἱκέτις*, cp. *Od.* 6. 310 *μητρὸς ποτὶ γούνασι χεῖρας | βάλλειν ἡμετέρης ἵνα νόστιμον*

των ἔλεγε τάδε. "ὦ βασιλεῦ Σπάρτης, ῥῦσαί με τὴν ἱκέτιν αἰχμαλώτου δουλοσύνης. σὺ γὰρ καὶ ἐς τόδε ὤνησας, τούσδε ἀπολέσας τοὺς οὔτε δαιμόνων οὔτε θεῶν ὄπιν ἔχοντας. εἰμὶ δὲ γένος μὲν Κῴη, θυγάτηρ δὲ Ἡγητορίδεω τοῦ Ἀνταγόρεω. βίῃ δέ με λαβὼν ἐν Κῷ εἶχε ὁ Πέρσης." ὃ δὲ ἀμείβεται

11 *βασιλεὺς* C || *ῥῦσαί* **B**, Stein², Holder, van H.: *λῦσαί* 12 *δουλωσύνης* R: *δουλωσύνην* C || *ἐς* del. Krueger, van H. 15 *βίη* B || *ἐν Κῷ* z: *ἐκ κῶ* **B**: *ἐν κῶ* ceteri: del. Kallenberg

ἦμαρ ἴδηαι, 7. 142 *ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' Ἀρήτης βάλε γούνασι χεῖρας Ὀδυσσεύς.* C. Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Gr. u. Röm.* 1890, 163. In order to perform such a gesture the suppliant would have to kneel or prostrate himself.

11. **ὦ βασιλεῦ Σπάρτης.** Thus this lady of Kos inaugurates the error which dies so hard; cp. c. 5 *supra*. She doubtless knew better, but thought there was nothing to lose by a little exaggeration: was the fatal ambition of Pausanias born in this moment? But after all *βασιλεύς* was not the technical term at Sparta, but *βαγός* or *ἀρχαγέτης*, cp. Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* i.² 47.

ῥῦσαί με τὴν ἱκέτιν: the article is idiomatic, with the appositive, "as regularly with personal pronouns" (Sitzler), cp. *ὑμέας . . τοὺς Ἀθηναίους* c. 46 *supra*.

12. **αἰχμαλώτου δ.**, a very strong genitive: from, out of, 'slavery as a prisoner of war.' In c. 90 *infra* *ἐκ* is expressed. The lady was not a prisoner of war to the Persians; but she is asking not to be treated as a prisoner of war by the Greeks.

ἐς τόδε, 'so far,' of time; cp. c. 73 *supra*; or perhaps of action, as explained in the next sentence.

13. **τοὺς οὔτε δαιμόνων οὔτε θεῶν ὄπιν ἔχοντας**: *ὄπις* 8. 143 in a similar connexion (on the lips of Aristeides?). The charge is, of course, unjust, even as respects 'the gods of Greece'; cp. *l.c. supra*; but allowance in this case may be made for a lady whose situation is not free from ambiguity.

δαίμονες, as distinct from **θεοί**, are not merely deities of lower rank, but perhaps distinctly 'deified dead'; so the departed Dareios, Aischyl. *Pers.* 620, the departed Alkestis, Eurip. *Alk.* 1003. Cp. Hesiod, *Wks.* 121 *αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο γένος* <sc. *τὸ χρύσεον*> *κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψεν, τοὶ μὲν δαίμονές εἰσι Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὰς ἐσθλοί, ἐπιχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

14. **γένος μὲν Κῴη**: the *γένος* here is locative rather than genetic. Kos was at this time under the government of Artemisia, cp. 7. 99, in succession to the righteous Kadmos, 7. 164. She ought to have given her own name.

Ἡγητορίδεω τοῦ Ἀνταγόρεω. Of these Koans, Hegetoridas (a truly aristocratic name) and his father Antagoras, nothing more appears to be known. Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 23, mentions an Antagoras of *Chios* as one of the leaders in the movement for the transfer of the hegemony from Sparta to Athens, and actually heading an attack on Pausanias. Polyainos 2. 33 has an anecdote of a Hegetoridas of *Thasos*, who was instrumental in bringing about the surrender of the island to Athens.

15. **βίῃ δέ με . . εἶχε ὁ Πέρσης.** 'The Persian' might have a more extended sense than Pharandates. Perhaps the lady had been kidnapped in her youth or infancy. It is not easy to see what Pharandates or the Persians generally would be doing in Kos; it is not even certain that Kos had joined in the 'Ionic' revolt, or we might suppose that the daughter of Pharandates had been carried off then; but cp. 7. 164 *supra*. The *βίῃ* might qualify both the participle and the verb (*ἔχειν*, cp. 8. 136. 4, and 8. 68. 12), but the lady of course may be overstating the case.

ὁ δὲ ἀμείβεται. The reply and the conduct of Pausanias proves him a *cavalier sans reproche*. This anecdote of the Koan Anonyma is the first of a series, in which the moral contrast between Hellenism and Barbarism is enforced and illustrated by incidents from the battle-field of Plataia.

τοισίδε. "γύναι, θάρσεε καὶ ὡς ἱκέτις καὶ εἰ δὴ πρὸς τούτῳ τυγχάνεις ἀληθέα λέγουσα καὶ εἶς θυγάτηρ Ἡγητορίδεω τοῦ Κῴου, ὃς ἐμοὶ ξεῖνος μάλιστα τυγχάνει ἐὼν τῶν περὶ ἐκείνους τοὺς χώρους οἰκημένων." ταῦτα δὲ εἴπας τότε μὲν ἐπέτρεψε τῶν ἐφόρων τοῖσι παρεοῦσι, ὕστερον δὲ ἀπέπεμψε ἐς Αἴγιναν, ἐς τὴν αὐτὴ ἤθελε ἀπικέσθαι.

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἄπιξιν τῆς γυναικός, αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα **77**
ἀπίκοντο Μαντινέες ἐπ' ἐξεργασμένοισι· μαθόντες δὲ ὅτι ὕστεροι ἥκουσι τῆς συμβολῆς, συμφορὴν ἐποιεῦντο μεγάλην, ἄξιοί τε ἔφασαν εἶναι σφέας ζημιῶσαι. πυνθανόμενοι δὲ τοὺς

---

16 *τοῖσιδε* Stein : *ὧδε* **B** : *τοῖσδε* ceteri ‖ *θάρσει* libri, Holder, van H. ‖ *τοῦτο* **B** 17 *εἷς* **B** : *εἰ* **a** : *εἶ* ceteri 18 *κείνους* **B** 19 *οἰκεομένων* z ‖ *μέν* <*μιν*> Bekker, van H. 21 *ἠθέλησεν* Marc. ‖ *ἀπικέσθαι* om. **B**, Holder, van H. **77.** 1 *μετὰ ταῦτα* del. Krueger, van H. 3 *ὕστεροι* Marc. z, Stein², van H. : *ὕστερον* ‖ *συμβουλῆς* **B**C 4 aut *ἀξίους* aut *σφεῖς* requirit van H. ‖ *εἶναι ἔφασαν* **B**

---

18. **ξεῖνος μάλιστα.** On *ξεινία* cp. 7. 116 *supra*.

τῶν περὶ ἐκ. τ. χ. οἰκημένων: cp. 7. 102 for the same phrase.

20. **τῶν ἐφόρων τοῖσι παρεοῦσι,** perhaps two in number; cp. Xenoph. *Respub. Lac.* 13. 5 *πάρεισι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐφόρων δύο, οἳ πολυπραγμονοῦσι μὲν οὐδέν, ἢν μὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς προσκαλῇ· ὁρῶντες δὲ ὅ τι ποιεῖ ἕκαστος πάντας σωφρονίζουσιν, ὡς τὸ εἰκός.* The fact that we do not find the presence of Ephors noted in the narratives of the fifth century does not prove that they were not present, but there are occasions upon which they are rather conspicuous by their absence, e.g. with Leotychidas at Mykale, with Pausanias at Byzantion, with Agis at Dekeleia (cp. Thuc. 8. 5. 3). Rawlinson, indeed, would date the regular practice described by Xenophon only to the year 403 B.C., cp. *Hell.* 2. 4. 36. But the present instance makes the practice look older, though it may not have affected the Navarchy.

ἐς Αἴγιναν. Hdt. does not say that there was any special facility for crossing from Aigina to Kos, but we may charitably suppose that the lady wished to return to her father's house, as, from the way Pausanias speaks, Hegetoridas must be still alive.

77. 1. **μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἄπιξιν**: for *ἄπιξις* (arrival, advent) cp. c. 17 *supra*. Hdt. is very exact in dating the next episode, so as to emphasize the advent of the Mantineians as too late, **ἐπ' ἐξεργασμένοισι**, cp. 8. 94, 4. 164. The Koan lady had reached the Lakedaimonians while they were still *ἐν τῇσι φονῇσι*.

αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα, a standing formula, cp. Index.

2. **ἀπίκοντο Μαντινέες**: this is their first appearance since Thermopylai, to which they sent a force equal to the Tegeatan, cp. 7. 202. They are not included in the army-list above, c. 28; the force here in question will have numbered probably 1000—1500 hoplites.

3. **ὕστεροι τῆς συμβολῆς**, 'too late for the engagement'; *σ.*, cp. c. 70 *supra*. If the Mantineians (and Eleians) arrive too late to take part in the great encounter, were they on other service—for example, guarding the convoy from the Peloponnesos, cp. c. 51 *supra*, or perhaps engaged, and retarded, by the Persian cavalry? The name of the Mantineians is not on the *τρικάρηνος ὄφις* (cp. 8. 82, and c. 81 *infra*), though that of the Eleians is.

συμφορὴν ποιέεσθαι: cp. 8. 10, 69. 2 *supra*, l. 9 *infra*.

4. **ἄξιοί τε ἔφασαν εἶναι σφέας ζημιῶσαι**: *ἄξιοι* is the idiomatic personal construction; cp. 8. 65. 11 (*αὐτός*). The sentence would be clearer perhaps without *σφέας*, leaving *ζημιῶσαι* as an epexegetical infinitive: as the object is expressed in *σφέας*, a subject must be understood, sc. *τοὺς Ἕλληνας, τὸν στρατηγόν*, or what not.

τοὺς Μήδους: here used generally

Μήδους τοὺς μετὰ Ἀρταβάζου φεύγοντας, τούτους ἐδίωκον μέχρι Θεσσαλίης· Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ οὐκ ἔων φεύγοντας διώκειν. οἳ δὲ ἀναχωρήσαντες ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν τοὺς ἡγεμόνας τῆς στρατιῆς ἐδίωξαν ἐκ τῆς γῆς. μετὰ δὲ Μαντινέας ἧκον Ἠλεῖοι, καὶ ὡσαύτως οἱ Ἠλεῖοι τοῖσι Μαντινεῦσι συμφορὴν ποιησάμενοι ἀπαλλάσσοντο· ἀπελθόντες δὲ καὶ οὗτοι τοὺς ἡγεμόνας ἐδίωξαν. τὰ κατὰ Μαντινέας μὲν καὶ Ἠλείους τοσαῦτα.

---

9 ἠλεῖοι PR || ἡλεῖοι BR || μαντιεῦσι C 11 τὰ om. **β** || ἠλείους PR

---

as = *τοὺς βαρβάρους*, and not in the specific sense of c. 31 *supra*.

5. **ἐδίωκον**, 'they were for pursuing,' they offered to pursue—a truly laughable offer on the part of these Mantineian hoplites. The indefinite or even the distant pursuit of a fugitive enemy was against Spartan custom, cp. 8. 108, and Blakesley understands the next sentence as a parenthesis intended to record not a particular prohibition on this occasion, but that general rule: the imperfect *οὐκ ἔων* hardly supports that view.

On the return of the Mantineians to their home **τοὺς ἡγεμόνας τῆς στρατιῆς ἐδίωξαν ἐκ τῆς γῆς.** The verb *ἐδίωξαν* (exiled) after the *ἐδίωκον* (pursued, or were for pursuing) just before makes a very unfortunate pun, albeit the contrast of the tenses is grammatically effective; perhaps it is only an "unconscious iteration." *τοὺς ἡγ. τῆς στ.* as a periphrasis for *τοὺς στρατηγούς*—if that be its significance—is remarkable. Perhaps the *ἡγεμονία* is emphasized as the offence was one of omission, incurred by the way. Possibly, however, there was a political background to the prosecution. Arkadia, or single states in Arkadia, may have been divided on the question of 'Medism,' cp. 8. 26. In the immediate sequel Mantineia sides with Sparta, or at least preserves a benevolent neutrality, when all the rest of Arkadia rises against her; cp. c. 35 *infra*. Mantineia was early and normally democratic; cp. 4. 161; but the discredit, which the *ἡγεμόνες* incurred in the Persian war, and the penalties meted out to them, may have brought about a temporary modification of the government of Mantineia (not without Lakonian approval). It does not follow that the leaders were really to blame. The injustice of the Athenian democracy (probably humaner than the Arkadian) towards unfortunate commanders is notorious; and the comic story in Thuc. 5. 60 of the treatment of Thrasylos, Strategos of Argos, by the Argive democracy in 418 B.C., has much the same moral.

8. **μετὰ δὲ Μαντινέας ἧκον Ἠλεῖοι:** naturally, as they had further to come. The Eleians had not even sent a contingent to Thermopylai. Yet their name appears upon the Delphian tripod; *I.G.A.* 70; Hill's *Sources*, i. 1; Hicks[2], No. 19 (5th Coil, No. 27). As the Eleians are not represented in the navy-lists of Artemision and Salamis, nor in the army-list c. 28 *supra*, the occurrence of their name on the monument is problematic (but they at least sent a contingent to the army under Kleombrotos in 480 B.C.; cp. 8. 72). Stein ascribes it to their influence with Sparta; but why then did not Sparta reward the Mantineians also? cp. also notes in Hicks *l.c.* and note to Παλέες in c. 28 *supra*. **ὡσαύτως**: 7. 86, etc.

9. **συμφορὴν ποιησάμενοι**: one of the chief grounds of this woe would be that they could have no lot in the Plataian booty, but there was also the loss of honour. The Eleians had a way of being rather behindhand; cp. Thuc. 5. 75. 5. The subsequent exile of their *ἡγεμόνες* may have a political significance, as in the case of the Mantineians above.

11. **τὰ κατὰ Μαντινέας μὲν καὶ Ἠλείους**: this story, or rather the brief note to the discredit of the two Peloponnesian democracies, might provoke the suspicion that there was some kind of understanding between them and Argos, not favourable to Sparta, and the recognition of the Spartan *ἡγεμονία*. But the service of the Mantineians at Thermopylai, the service of the Eleians at the Isthmos, and the arrival of both, even if belated, on the field of Plataia, have to be put in the other scale.

Ἐν δὲ Πλαταιῇσι ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τῶν Αἰγινητέων ἦν 78
Λάμπων Πυθέω, Αἰγινητέων <ἐὼν> τὰ πρῶτα· ὃς ἀνοσιώτατον ἔχων λόγον ἵετο πρὸς Πausανίην, ἀπικόμενος δὲ σπουδῇ ἔλεγε τάδε. "ὦ παῖ Κλεομβρότου, ἔργον ἔργασταί τοι ὑπερφυὲς μέγαθός τε καὶ κάλλος, καί τοι θεὸς παρέδωκε ῥυσάμενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα κλέος καταθέσθαι μέγιστον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. σὺ δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοισι ποίησον, ὅκως λόγος τέ σε ἔχῃ ἔτι μέζων καί τις ὕστερον φυλάσσηται τῶν βαρβάρων μὴ ὑπάρχειν ἔργα ἀτάσθαλα ποιέων ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας. Λεωνίδεω γὰρ ἀποθανόντος ἐν

78. 1 *πλαταίηισι* **α** : *πλαταίησιν* **β** 2 *ὁ πυθέω* **β** : *ὁ Πύθεω* z || *ἐὼν* add. Stein[2], Holder, van H. || *τὰ πρῶτα φέρων* z 3 *λόγον ἔχων* z || *ιετο* A : *ἵετο* ceteri (ap. Stein) : *ἵκετο* SV 7 *τὰ λοιπὰ* del. Cobet, van H. 8 *μείζων* **α** 10 *ποιέειν* **β**

Plutarch, in the *de malign. Hdti*, takes no exception to this record; but has the whole truth been told in the case? The story does not come from Mantineian and Eleian sources, or we should have had more particulars, and perhaps something to the good credit of the States. What is related—*καὶ φθόνῳ ἂν εἴποιεν*.

78. 1. ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τῶν Αἰγινητέων: there were but 500 Aiginetan hoplites, all told, cp. c. 28 *supra*; as they were posted next to the Megarians, they may have been literally *ἐν Πλαταιῇσι* at this time; but cp. c. 76 *supra*. They should have been *ἐν τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι*, cp. c. 69 *ad f.*

2. **Λάμπων Πυθέω**: to be distinguished from the Athenian, c. 21 *supra*, and the Samian, c. 90 *infra*, of the same name; but this Aiginetan Lampon, son of Pytheas, may be identified (as by K. O. Müller, *Aeginetica* 126) with Lampon, father of Pytheas and Phylakides, whose victories Pindar celebrates in *Nem.* 5, *Isth.* 4 and 5. The Pytheas, son of Ischenoos, captured off Skiathos, 7. 181 *supra*, and liberated at Salamis, 8. 92, can hardly be identical with the father of Lampon, but he may be of the same house, the *Ψαλυχιάδαι*, or *Ψαλυχίδαι*, Pindar, *Isth.* 5 (6). 63.

τὰ πρῶτα: as in 6. 100. On this occasion Lampon may have been Strategos of the Aiginetans.

ἀνοσιώτατον ἔχων λόγον, 'with a most impious (shocking) proposal.'

3. **ἵετο**, 'came full speed'; repeated in *ἀπικόμενος σπουδῇ*.

σπουδῇ: cp. cc. 1, 66 *supra*, etc.

4. **ὦ παῖ Κλεομβρότου**: cp. c. 76 l. 9.

5. **ὑπερφυές**, 'supernatural,' 'colossal,' in a bad sense 8. 116; here in a good.

μέγαθός τε καὶ κάλλος: generally of corporeal beauty; cp. c. 72 *supra*. Pausanias' work was a *καλλίστη νίκη*, c. 64 *supra*. The accusative is "of reference." Cp. Index.

τοι . . ῥυσάμενον is not strict grammar; cp. c. 58. 13, 15 *supra*.

θεὸς παρέδωκε: cp. 7. 18, 5. 67. The god would probably be Zeus.

6. **κλέος καταθέσθαι**: 7. 220.

μέγιστον . . τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν: the formula (cp. 8. 105 *supra*) is here especially interesting, as used, not by the historian *propria persona*, but by one of his puppets. The use is hardly quite accurate: the *τῶν* is presumably masculine, referring to *Ἑλλήνων*, though the reference to *κλέος* might be eased by the use of that word in the plural (*κλέα ἀνδρῶν Il.* 9. 189, *Od.* 8. 73); but *πάντων* is here desiderated in either case. The fame of Leonidas (who is named just below) is here given a distinct set-back; but with posterity the failure of Thermopylai has ever outshone the success at Plataia; cp. Leopardi's *All' Italia*.

7. **ἐπί** here nearly = *πρός*; cp. 7. 236 (or 'after').

8. **λόγος . . σε ἔχῃ**: *λόγος* here comes near to *κλέος*, *δόξα*: cp. *λ. ἀγαθός* 7. 5. 11.

τις = *πᾶς τις*.

9. **φυλάσσηται . . μὴ ὑπάρχειν**: an idiomatic negative; we should say, 'beware of beginning . .' In point of form this sentence is identical with the phraseology in 7. 5 *ἵνα λόγος τε κτλ.*, but the idiomatic *μή* is there dropped.

ἀτάσθαλα: cp. c. 116 *infra*.

Θερμοπύλῃσι Μαρδόνιός τε καὶ Ξέρξης ἀποταμόντες τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνεσταύρωσαν· τῷ σὺ τὴν ὁμοίην ἀποδιδοὺς ἔπαινον ἕξεις πρῶτα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων Σπαρτιητέων, αὖτις δὲ καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων· Μαρδόνιον γὰρ ἀνασκολοπίσας τετιμω-
79 ρήσεαι ἐς πάτρων τὸν σὸν Λεωνίδην." ὃ μὲν δοκέων χαρίζεσθαι ἔλεγε τάδε, ὃ δ' ἀνταμείβετο τοισίδε. "ὦ ξεῖνε Αἰγινῆτα, τὸ μὲν εὐνοέειν τε καὶ προορᾶν ἄγαμαί σευ, γνώμης μέντοι ἡμάρτηκας χρηστῆς· ἐξαείρας γάρ με ὑψοῦ καὶ τὴν πάτρην καὶ τὸ ἔργον, ἐς τὸ μηδὲν κατέβαλες παραινέων νεκρῷ λυμαί-

12 ἐσταύρωσαν **β** 13 ὑπὸ τῶν Σπαρτιητέων πάντων z 14 ἀνασκολοπήσας B ‖ τετιμωρήσεαι Suevern, Stein, Holder: τετιμώρησαι (cp. Cobet *Mnemos.* XII. 388: post τετιμώρησαι (quod servat) lacunam indicat van H. cp. *Mnemos.* XIII. 166) **79.** 2 δὲ **β** ‖ τοισίδε Holder, van H.: τοῖσιδε Marc., Stein: τοίσι δὲ C: τοῖσδε 3 εὐνοεῖν **β**Pz, Holder, van H. ‖ πρώραν B ‖ σου **α** 4 ἐξάιρας **α**: ἐξᾴρας z: ἐξάρας 5 κατέβαλλες? Stein[1]

11. **Μαρδόνιός τε καὶ Ξέρξης**: there is nothing in the story as told 7. 238 to implicate the living Mardonios in the outrage; but there is, of course, no direct inconsistency in Hdt.'s allowing Lampon to discredit the dead Mardonios, though we are hardly justified in arguing, as we might do in the case of a more careful writer, that he himself acquits Mardonios. More probably he has followed his source in each case, without noting the potential inconsistency; perhaps the anecdote in 8. 114 suggested that Mardonios was concerned in the case.

12. **τῷ** is ambiguous: grammatically it might seem to belong to Λεωνιδέω, but naturally it seems to refer to **Μαρδόνιος.** Taking **τὴν ὁμοίην** as = δίκην, or τὴν ὁμ. χάριν, or τίσιν, it would, however, make good sense to refer the relative to **Λεωνίδεω.** The introduction of the name **Μαρδόνιον γάρ** just below also favours this interpretation, and especially the expression in c. 79 below, Λεωνίδῃ δὲ τῷ με κελεύεις τιμωρῆσαι κτλ.

ἀποδιδούς is strictly conditional: perhaps the tense, as compared with **ἀνασκολοπίσας** just below, also favours the reference of τῷ to Leonidas, not to Mardonios.

ἔπαινον ἕξεις . . ὑπό. On the ἐπαινετοί cp. c. 71 *supra*; the phrase here is hardly used in the technical sense. **ὑπό** as ἔπ. ἕξ. = ἐπαινεθήσεαι (Stein); cp. c. 75. 6 *supra.*

14. **ἀνασκολοπίζειν,** 'to impale': cp. for the subst. c. 97; for the verb, and the barbarous practice, 1. 128, 3. 159, 4. 43, 202.

τετιμωρήσεαι: cp. App. Crit., the future perfect, passive; doubly remarkable in respect both of the voice and of the tense; though passive in form, it must here be middle in sense, "thou wilt have taken vengeance in respect to Leonidas" (so too τετιμώρημαι in some cases; cp. L. & S.). The active and passive of the verb are used in the next chapter. The normal construction of the verb is τινί (pers.), or ὑπέρ τινός τινα (pers.), τινός (*rei*), or τί. With the use of **ἐς** here cp. ἐς Λεωνίδην c. 64 *supra.*

15. **πάτρων**: Kleombrotos, the father of Pausanias, being brother of Leonidas; cp. c. 10 *supra.*

79. 1. **χαρίζεσθαι**: *gratificari*, 6. 130.

3. **προορᾶν**: in regard to the future fame of Pausanias.

ἄγαμαι: perhaps not without a slight touch of irony or persiflage; cp. 4. 46, 157, 6. 76, 8. 144.

4. **καὶ τὴν πάτρην καὶ τὸ ἔργον.** On the strong co-ordination cp. c. 26 *supra.* On πάτρη cp. c. 76 *supra.* In the speech of Lampon reference has been made to Kleombrotos and to Leonidas, but hardly to Sparta, as a state or fatherland (except in the words ἔπαινον ἕξεις πρῶτον μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων Σπαρτιητέων). The accusatives are "of reference"; cp. c. 72 *supra.*

5. **ἐς τὸ μηδὲν κατέβαλες**: sc. ἐμέ. With τὸ μηδέν cp. 8. 106.

νεσθαι, καὶ ἢν ταῦτα ποιέω, φὰς ἄμεινόν με ἀκούσεσθαι· τὰ πρέπει μᾶλλον βαρβάροισι ποιέειν ἤ περ Ἕλλησι, καὶ ἐκείνοισι δὲ ἐπιφθονέομεν. ἐγὼ δ' ὦν τούτου εἵνεκα μήτε Αἰγινήτῃσι ἅδοιμι μήτε τοῖσι ταῦτα ἀρέσκεται, ἀποχρᾷ τέ μοι Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἀρεσκόμενον ὅσια μὲν ποιέειν, ὅσια δὲ καὶ λέγειν. Λεωνίδῃ δέ, τῷ με κελεύεις τιμωρῆσαι, φημὶ μεγάλως <τε> τετιμωρῆσθαι, ψυχῇσί τε τῇσι τῶνδε ἀναριθμήτοισι τετίμηται αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι τελευτήσαντες. σὺ μέντοι

---

6 *ποιέωι* B: *ποιέῳ* z   7 *βαρβάροισι μᾶλλον* **B** || *κἀκείνοισι* **B**, Holder, van H: *κᾀκείνοισι* z   9 *ἁδοιμι* A: *ἅδοιμι* B || *ταὐτὰ* Bekker, Holder, van H. || *ἀποχρᾶ* S || *τέ* V (ap. Holder), Stein³: *τε* S (ap. Gaisford): *δέ* **a** etc., Stein¹ ², Holder, van H.: *δέ τέ* R: (*δ' ἐμοὶ* Gaisford) 11 <*τε*> Stein³   12 *τε*: *γε* Gomperz, van H. || *τῇσι* om. Marc. z

---

6. **ἄμεινον . . ἀκούσεσθαι**: cp. 8. 93, also c. 107 *infra* (the active is usual).

τὰ πρέπει μᾶλλον βαρβάροισι ποιέειν ἤ περ Ἕλλησι: this sentence gives the two-edged moral of the anecdote, cutting the barbarians and the Aiginetan to boot; while Pausanias again emerges as the *chevalier sans reproche*; cp. c. 76 *supra*. *πρέπει* is strictly relative; cp. 8. 68, 114. In the latter passage may be found an undesigned commentary or complement to the present anecdote: the recompense made by Mardonios, as prophesied, was in a double sense *οἵας ἐκείνοισι* (sc. *Ἕλλησι*) *πρέπει*.

8. **ἐπιφθονέομεν**: *non tam invidiae quam odii significatione*, Baehr: 'we grudge it them even,' we think none the better of them therefor. With **καὶ ἐκείνοισι δέ** cp. 2. 44 *καὶ δοκέουσι δέ μοι*, 4. 105 *καὶ ὀμνῦσι δὲ λέγοντες*. The *καί* is emphatic.

δ' ὦν, 'however that may be.' Cp. Index.

τούτου εἵνεκα, 'as far as that is concerned'; or, if it depends on that.

μήτε Αἰγινήτῃσι ἅδοιμι: the animus of the anecdote is very plainly revealed in this pious wish; the Aiginetans one and all were to be damnified, otherwise there seems no very obvious reason for making them responsible for the unholy propositions of their fellow-citizen. The animus here evinced is presumably Attic, and of long standing (cp. 7. 145); and such stories would have been greedily swallowed in Athens about the time of the first Peloponnesian war and the reduction of Aigina (462–457 B.C.). It seems, then, unnecessary to bring this passage down to the final expulsion of the Aiginetans in 431 B.C. (cp. 6. 91), much less with H. B. Wright, *Campaign of Plataea* (1904) p. 79 (following Knapp), to see in it a justification of the massacre of 424 B.C. See further, Introduction, § 9.

ἁνδάνω with personal subject is unusual.

9. **ἀποχρᾷ**: cp. 8. 130, also 7. 148; with an expressed subject c. 94 *infra*.

11. **τῷ . . τιμωρῆσαι**, 'to avenge whom,' in the normal construction. The perf. pass. neut. construction which follows implies the government of an accusative *rei* by the active. Cp. previous chapter, note to l. 14.

12. **ψυχῇσί τε . . τετίμηται**: as by a sacrifice, hecatomb on hecatomb. The animistic idea underlying this magnificent utterance is not perfectly clear. What has become of 'the countless souls of these men here,' and where now are 'those who met their end at Thermopylai' (*οἱ ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι τελευτήσαντες*)? The antithesis between *αἱ ψυχαί* and *τῶνδε* might recall the Homeric antithesis between the *πολλὰς ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς ἡρώων* sent to Hades and the *ἥρωας αὐτούς* left lying on the earth, a prey for dogs and vultures (*Il.* ad init.). The souls of Leonidas and his men must surely be down there too: the barbarians' souls are sent to bear them company, and to wait upon them, in strict conformity with animistic beliefs. Such a sacrifice upon a smaller scale Achilles performed at the tomb of Patroklos (cp. *Il.* 23. 19 ff.); and the battle of Plataia, from this point of view, was a superb *ἀγὼν ἐπιτάφιος* in honour of Leonidas and his fellows.

ἔτι ἔχων λόγον τοιόνδε μήτε προσέλθῃς ἔμοιγε μήτε συμβουλεύσῃς, χάριν τε ἴσθι ἐὼν ἀπαθής.”

80 *Ὁ μὲν ταῦτα ἀκούσας ἀπαλλάσσετο. Παυσανίης δὲ κήρυγμα ποιησάμενος μηδένα ἅπτεσθαι τῆς ληίης, συγκομίζειν ἐκέλευε τοὺς εἵλωτας τὰ χρήματα. οἱ δὲ ἀνὰ τὸ στρατόπεδον σκιδνάμενοι εὕρισκον σκηνὰς κατεσκευασμένας χρυσῷ καὶ ἀργύρῳ, κλίνας τε ἐπιχρύσους καὶ ἐπαργύρους, κρητῆράς τε χρυσέους καὶ φιάλας τε καὶ ἄλλα ἐκπώματα· σάκκους τε ἐπ᾽ ἁμαξέων εὕρισκον, ἐν τοῖσι λέβητες ἐφαίνοντο ἐνεόντες χρύσεοί τε καὶ ἀργύρεοι· ἀπό τε τῶν κειμένων νεκρῶν ἐσκύλευον ψέλιά τε καὶ στρεπτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀκινάκας ἐόντας χρυσέους, ἐπεὶ ἐσθῆτός γε ποικίλης λόγος ἐγίνετο οὐδείς. ἐνθαῦτα πολλὰ μὲν κλέπτοντες ἐπώλεον πρὸς τοὺς Αἰγινήτας οἱ εἵλωτες, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἀπεδείκνυσαν, ὅσα αὐτῶν οὐκ οἷά τε ἦν κρύψαι· ὥστε Αἰγινήτῃσι*

14 *ἔτι* om. Marc. || *ἔμοιγε*: *ἐμὲ* R || *συμβουλεύῃς* PMarc. *z* 15 *τε ἴσθι* *z*: *ἴσθι τε* **80.** 2 *ἐκέλευσε* **B** 4 *χρυσῷ* <*τε*> van H. 6 *καὶ φιάλας* **B***z*, Stein², Holder, van H.: *φιάλας* || *ἄλλα*: *ἄλλα καὶ* C || *σάκκους*: *θάκους* C: ‘An *σάκους*?’ van H. 7 *ἐόντες* **B** 8 *ψέλλιά* Marc. *z* 9 *ἀκινάκεας* S, Wesseling, Gaisford 10 *ἐγέντετο* SV || *οὐδὲ εἷς* **B**, Holder, van H. 11 *οἱ* om. R 12 *αὐτέων* **B***z*

15. **χάριν τε ἴσθι**: the *τε* is cumulative, ‘and indeed’; cp. c. 70. *χάριν εἰδέναι* 3. 21. Cp. *χάριν ἔχειν* 7. 120. With the ‘sentiment’ cp. the Athenian remark to Alexander, 8. 143 *ad f.*

80. 2. **μηδένα ἅπτεσθαι τῆς ληίης**: no one was to touch the spoil, in order that it might be duly collected and divided. As implied above, c. 70, the Tegeatai disregarded this order, unless indeed its issue was subsequent to their plunder of the tent of Mardonios, or unless the implication in that passage is unjust.

3. **τοὺς εἵλωτας**: but surely not to the number of 40,000, c. 29 *supra.*

ἀνά: *passim per* . .

τὸ στρατόπεδον: sc. *Περσέων.*

σκιδνάμενοι: cp. 8. 23.

5. **ἐπιχρύσους**: i.e. ‘gilt,’ cp. 1. 50. In the following inventory of treasure **κρητῆρας** are large mixing bowls; **φιάλας** smaller vessels, primarily for pouring, cp. 8. 54 (*χεϝ*, FUD, cp. Curt. *Gr. Etym.*² p. 186); **ἐκπώματα** drinking vessels; **ἄλλα** being idiomatic, ‘as well,’ cp. 3. 55. 5 *supra.* The Persians were hard drinkers, cp. 1. 133.

7. **λέβητες**: cauldrons, or pots, not primarily connected with drinking; why these were already packed in baize or bags (*σάκκους*) ready for departure, and the others not so, is obscure.

8. **ψέλια, στρεπτούς**: cp. 8. 113. Possibly only the ‘Persians’ were so decorated. **τοὺς ἀκινάκας**, ‘their swords,’ referring, as the article shows, especially to the notorious ‘Persian’ weapon; cp. 7. 54. The hilt and sheath might have been of gold, or covered therewith: or were the blades damascened?

9. **ἐπεί**, in an adversative sense, implying a suppressed sentence (‘of mere clothing I say nothing,’ or sim.); cp. L. & S. *sub v.* B. 4.

10. **λόγος ἐγίνετο οὐδείς**, ‘no account was (being) taken’—embroidered robes, etc., were at a discount. *λόγος*, cp. 4. 135.

11. **πρὸς τοὺς Αἰγινήτας**: not necessarily the 500 hoplites, or the survivors of them (cp. cc. 28, 69 *supra*); but the animus of the story is obvious; see previous chapter.

ἀπεδείκνυσαν, duly reported or ‘accounted for’; cp. 8. 35.

12. **ὥστε . . ἐγένοντο**: a transparent scandal, perhaps of Attic origin, which Hdt. could hardly have thus accepted, or endorsed, had he known as much

οἱ μεγάλοι πλοῦτοι ἀρχὴν ἐνθεῦτεν ἐγένοντο, οἳ τὸν χρυσὸν ἅτε ἐόντα χαλκὸν δῆθεν παρὰ τῶν εἱλώτων ὠνέοντο. συμφορή- 81
σαντες δὲ τὰ χρήματα καὶ δεκάτην ἐξελόντες τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι

---

14 εἱλώτεων R: εἱλωτέων *z*

---

about the Aiginetans when he first penned this passage as he afterwards came to know; cp. 2. 178 etc. It is very unlikely that this scandal is to be dated (as Stein suggests) after the expulsion of the Aiginetans from their island in 431 B.C. Aiginetan wealth and greatness was a thing of the past after 457 B.C., but the scandal in regard to their origin does not necessitate even the inference that they were no more when it circulated; rather indeed the reverse: *φθόνος* dealt with the living present; cp. 7. 236 and note to previous chapter, l. 8.

13. **ἀρχήν**, 'originally,' cp. Index. The plural **πλοῦτοι**, perhaps because the wealth was not *ἐν τῷ κοινῷ*, but distributed in several holdings (not like the Latin *divitiae*, *fortunae*, *bona*, *opes*, etc.); cp. Plato *Rep.* 618 B. The article, as with *ἀκινάκας* above.

ἐνθεῦτεν: neither temporal nor local, but causal; cp. Thuc. 1. 5. 1 *τὸν πλεῖστον τοῦ βίου ἐντεῦθεν ἐποιοῦντο*, Aristot. *Eth. N.* 5. 3. 6 = 1131 a 23 *ἐντεῦθεν αἱ μάχαι καὶ τὰ ἐγκλήματα ὅταν κτλ.*

οἵ, 'for they . . ' exchanged on the *χρύσεα χαλκείων* principle: **ἅτε ἐόντα χαλκὸν δῆθεν.** With the innocence of the helots (who, however, in this case were only robbers robbed) Wesseling and many commentators since have compared what Philippe de Comines, 5. 2, has to say of the Helvetians and their treatment of the spoil after the defeat of Charles the Bold at Granson, A.D. 1476. The anecdote in Hdt. may be intended not merely to discredit the Aiginetans but to raise a laugh at the expense of Sparta, with its iron money and so on. As a matter of fact the glint of gold was as recognizable in Sparta as anywhere in the Greek world (cp. 1. 69, 3. 148, 5. 51); if there was any pilfering on the field, and selling of stolen goods, no doubt the thieves sold cheap, not so much because they did not know the difference between gold and brass, as because they had to get rid of stolen goods as quickly as possible.

81. 2. **δεκάτην ἐξελόντες.** Stein conceives the tithe (or the tithes) as composed not of actual spoils, but of values. That being so, the spoils must have been valued, and even sold, before the tithe was actually handed over; unless we suppose that a rough estimate and division of spoil was made, and the tithes then converted into money. In either case, however, some time will have elapsed before this operation was complete, and it was hardly completed on the field of Plataia. Three gods are mentioned, three sacred places, as recipients and receptacles; but it is not clear whether one-tenth of all the spoil was divided among the three gods (in which case each would have received in reality a thirtieth of the whole: Larcher's view), or whether, as seems more probable, each of the three divinities received a full tithe (Baehr and others). Here again, however, there is an unresolved obscurity; it might be argued that only Delphi obtained the full tithe (the Amphiktyonic shrine being of greatest pan-Hellenic importance); that a tithe of what remained (i.e. $\frac{1}{10}$ of $\frac{9}{10}$) was given to Olympia, the Peloponnesian centre, while to the Isthmos went a tithe of the remainder ($\frac{10 : 9 : 8\frac{1}{10}}{100}$ being thus the proportionate shares). But that arrangement looks rather complicated!

τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεῷ. If a tithe of the spoil of Plataia was on the battle-field set apart and consecrated to the god in Delphi, the victors can scarcely have held the god, or his ministers, guilty of medism.

Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 11, shows the lengths to which the *Rettung* of Delphi could be carried: according to that story the god in Delphi had dictated the very spot for the Greek victory, and that in response to an Athenian inquiry!

Of the material reality and historic authenticity of the *Anathema* at Delphi there cannot be a shadow of doubt; but the precise date at which it was made, or provided for, the exact method by which the expenses were defrayed, are doubtful points. The list of states upon

θεῷ, ἀπ' ἧς ὁ τρίπους ὁ χρύσεος ἀνετέθη ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ τρικαρήνου ὄφιος τοῦ χαλκέου ἐπεστεὼς ἄγχιστα τοῦ βωμοῦ, καὶ τῷ ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ θεῷ ἐξελόντες, ἀπ' ἧς δεκάπηχυν χάλκεον Δία ἀνέθηκαν, καὶ τῷ ἐν Ἰσθμῷ θεῷ, ἀπ' ἧς ἑπτάπηχυς χάλκεος

---

81. 4 ὄφεος z || ἐφεστεὼς **B** 6 ἀνέθηκε **B**

---

the *τρικάρηνος ὄφις* still legible proves that the monument was not merely a memorial of Plataia (even if offered from the spoil of that battle exclusively), for names occur upon it which were not represented at Plataia.

The monument consisted of two parts, as here described: (*a*) the golden *λέβης* or *κρατήρ*, elevated upon (*b*) a pillar, having the appearance of a three-headed serpent wound round a column. Thucydides, 1. 132. 2, does not accurately distinguish the two parts, but speaks of the whole offering as *ὁ τρίπους*. The golden bowl was melted down by the Phokians in the Sacred War, Pausan. 10. 13. 5. The (gilt) bronze pillar upon which it stood was carried off to Constantinople by the founder, where it was discovered in the *Atmeidan* by C. T. Newton in 1855 and the inscribed names deciphered, as frequently since. Cp. Otto Frick, *Das plataeische Weihgeschenk*, Leipzig, 1859; Fabricius *D.A.I.* 1. 176 ff.; Hicks, *Manual*,[2] No. 19, etc. But especially Frazer, *Pausanias* v. 299–307, where the modern literature is fully given; cp. also 8. 82 *supra*, Introduction § 10, Appendix I.

This monument has perhaps the longest and most continuous literary history in antiquity of any *objet d'art*, having been noticed by Hdt. (*bis*), Thucydides (1. 132. 2, 3. 57. 2), ps.-Demosth. (*c. Neaer.* § 97), C. Nepos (*Pausan.* 1), Diodoros (11. 33. 2), Plutarch (*de malig. Hdti* 42 = *Mor.* 873), Pausanias (10. 13. 5), Ael. Aristeides (iii. 290 B ed. Cantero, 1604), Suidas (*sub v.* *Παυσανίας*).

4. **ἄγχιστα τοῦ βωμοῦ.** The altar here mentioned is identical with the altar 'dedicated by the Chians' mentioned in 2. 135, and stood in front of the temple, where its remains have been found; cp. Pausanias 10. 14. 7 (Frazer, v. 309).

The base of the 'Plataian' monument has also been found (cp. Frazer, v. 299). The particularity of the description here is not quite conclusive evidence that Hdt. had visited Delphi, and seen the 'Tripod' before writing the passage, for the immediate context contains evidence of his having consulted written authorities in regard to the allocation of the spoils, and he does not here specify the connexion of the Chians with the altar, as in 2. 135, a passage in which "autopsy" is much more evident than here. But it need not therefore be denied for the present chapter, which might very well be an addition to the original draft of the work, to be dated after his (first) visit to Greece; cp. Introduction, § 9.

τῷ ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ θεῷ: i.e. Zeus. Pausanias, 5. 23. 1–2, describes the bronze figure, adds that it was dedicated by the Greeks who fought at Plataia, and gives the list of cities which took part 'in the battle,' from an inscription on the right side of the base. The names of the islanders from Keos, Melos, Tenos again throw some doubt on the question whether the list was rigidly limited to the combatants at Plataia. This inscription has not been recovered; and we are therefore dependent for its contents on the report of Pausanias, not in all respects above suspicion. Cp. Introduction, § 10. For the size of the statue (15 feet) upon the testimony of Hdt. cp. further Frazer, *Pausanias* iii. 630 f.

6. **τῷ ἐν Ἰσθμῷ θεῷ**: i.e. Poseidon. A dedication to Poseidon from the spoils of Plataia seems hardly called for, and supports the view that these offerings and monuments had reference to the whole war; the suggestion is fortified by the observation that no special dedications are recorded for Artemision and Mykale, the latter of which at least must have been reckoned a victory. (Was this offering connected with it?) Hdt. however (8. 121) has recorded a dedication at Delphi after Salamis, which may have been identical with the Apollo, 'from the spoils of Artemision and Salamis,' mentioned by Pausanias 10. 14. 5. The dedication at the Isthmos is quite lost sight of subsequently; cp. 8. 121 *supra*. The substitution of **ἐξεγένετο** for *ἀνετέθη* may be merely a

Ποσειδέων ἐξεγένετο, ταῦτα ἐξελόντες τὰ λοιπὰ διαιρέοντο, καὶ ἔλαβον ἕκαστοι τῶν ἄξιοι ἦσαν, καὶ τὰς παλλακὰς τῶν Περσέων καὶ τὸν χρυσὸν καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον καὶ τἆλλα χρήματά τε καὶ ὑποζύγια. ὅσα μέν νυν ἐξαίρετα τοῖσι ἀριστεύσασι αὐτῶν ἐν Πλαταιῇσι ἐδόθη, οὐ λέγεται πρὸς οὐδαμῶν, δοκέω δ' ἔγωγε καὶ τούτοισι δοθῆναι· Παυσανίῃ δὲ πάντα δέκα ἐξαιρέθη τε καὶ ἐδόθη, γυναῖκες ἵπποι τάλαντα κάμηλοι, ὡς δὲ αὔτως καὶ τἆλλα χρήματα.

---

7 *ἐγένετο* **B** 8 *ἦσαν* om. Marc. : *ἔσαν* z || *παλακὰς* C 9 *τὸν ἄργυρον* **B**Pz : *ἄργυρον* || *τἆλλα* coni. Stein[1], rec. van H., Stein[3] : *ἄλλα* 11 *αὐτέων* **B**Cz || *πλαταίῃσι* **a** : *πλαταίῃσιν* **B** 12 *δ'* : *δὲ* **B** 13 *τε καὶ ἐδόθη* om. **B**, Holder, van H. || *τάλαντα* : *ἅρματα* ? Stein || *ὡς* PRz 14 *τὰ ἄλλα* **B**

---

stylistic variation, but in fact Hdt. does not expressly say that the bronze Poseidon was ever actually erected: Pausanias in describing the Isthmos (2. 1. 7 etc.), though he mentions several images of Poseidon, does not attempt to identify any of them with the one here in question.

7. **τὰ λοιπὰ διαιρέοντο**: it appears just below that another *δεκάτη* (possibly of what was left) was reserved for the commander-in-chief, Pausanias, and if we allow the Helots 10 per cent for their pilferings, above recorded, it appears that of all the spoil only one-half would remain for division among all the various states concerned, and their commanders, or to furnish the rewards of valour.

8. **ἔλαβον ἕκαστοι τῶν ἄξιοι ἦσαν.** On what principle the distribution was effected is not indicated: was it the relative size of the contingents (*κατὰ τὸν στρατιωτῶν ἀριθμὸν* Diodor. 11. 33. 1)? Or this simple principle may have been combined with a consideration of services rendered, the proportion of dead, and so forth. Nor is it clear who made the awards, whether the whole council of war, or the Hegemonic state (cp. c. 27 *supra*), or the commander-in-chief. It is unlikely that the awards gave complete satisfaction to every one, cp. c. 70 *supra*. On the plural *ἕκαστοι* cp. 7. 1. 7 etc.

9. **τἆλλα**: the *ἄλλα* is idiomatic, 'besides'; cp. c. 80 *supra*.

10. **τοῖσι ἀριστεύσασι**: according to Hdt. there had been, and was, no award to any state collectively, cp. c. 71 *supra*, or at least he could not discover any; he might seem here, therefore, to be referring to individuals, but it is likely that individuals, *ἀριστεύσαντες*, would have been rewarded out of the share of their state and not out of the common or undivided booty: the case of the commander-in-chief would stand on a different footing.

11. **οὐ λέγεται πρὸς οὐδαμῶν.** As Rawlinson points out, this phrase indicates that Hdt. consulted authors, i.e. written authorities; cp. Introduction, § 10. Their silence was perhaps a part of the conspiracy of silence on the whole question of the *ἀριστεῖα*, cp. c. 71 *supra*.

12. **καὶ τούτοισι** as well as to the gods and the commander-in-chief. These would have been the Plataians if the story in Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 20, be true. Plutarch, indeed, not only records the extra allowances to the Plataians, but names the temple (dedicated to Athene) which was built therefrom.

πάντα δέκα. Rawlinson renders "ten specimens of each kind of thing," which gives a rather curious and hardly adequate result when you come to details. Stein has (cp. 4. 88) "alles zehnfach," i.e. ten times as much of each and everything as he would have had on an ordinary occasion, 'a tenfold portion': the case was evidently an extraordinary one. How much exactly his portion amounted to does not appear, but it will probably have been not less than another tithe of the spoil—though that exact meaning can hardly be got out of the expression here.

13. **γυναῖκες**, as though the men had all been slain: this was not, however, the case, as the next anecdote shows. For **τάλαντα** Stein suggests *ἅρματα*.

82 Λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε γενέσθαι, ὡς Ξέρξης φεύγων ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος Μαρδονίῳ τὴν κατασκευὴν καταλίποι τὴν ἑωυτοῦ. Παυσανίην ὦν ὁρῶντα τὴν Μαρδονίου σκηνὴν χρυσῷ τε καὶ ἀργύρῳ καὶ παραπετάσμασι ποικίλοισι κατεσκευασμένην, κελεῦσαι τούς τε ἀρτοκόπους καὶ τοὺς ὀψοποιοὺς κατὰ ταὐτὰ καθὼς Μαρδονίῳ δεῖπνον παρασκευάζειν. ὡς δὲ κελευόμενοι οὗτοι ἐποίευν ταῦτα, ἐνθαῦτα τὸν Παυσανίην ἰδόντα κλίνας τε χρυσέας καὶ ἀργυρέας εὖ ἐστρωμένας καὶ τραπέζας τε χρυσέας καὶ ἀργυρέας καὶ παρασκευὴν μεγαλοπρεπέα τοῦ δείπνου, ἐκπλαγέντα τὰ προκείμενα ἀγαθὰ κελεῦσαι ἐπὶ γέλωτι τοὺς

82. 2 παρασκευὴν Athenaeus p. 138 || καταλίπει C 3 ὁρέοντα P Marc. z, Stein[1]: ὁρέωντα C || σκηνὴν Schweighaeuser, Stein[3]: κατασκευὴν 4 ποικίλῃσι C || κατασκευασμένην ASV, Schaefer, Gaisford: παρασκευασμένην C 5 ἀρτοπόπους Cobet: 'volgatam tuetur inscr.' van H. 6 καθὼς: καὶ Schaefer: ὡς καὶ? Stein: del. Abicht, Gomperz, van H. || κατασκευάζειν β 8 εὖ . . ἀργυρέας om. B[1]Sz || τε post χρυσέας β 10 γέλωτα S

κάμηλοι have not been mentioned since 7. 125 (except for 7. 184. 20), and have played no part in the campaign. They cannot have been much used in Greece, and no doubt quickly died out, for camels were evidently a curiosity there early in the fourth century B.C., cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 3. 4. 24 (though they are to be seen there to-day: Itea, 17.4.'05). The horses may have been used to improve the Hellenic breeds, perhaps helped to mount the first Athenian cavalry, and reappear on the frieze of Pheidias in their descendants.

ὣς δ' αὔτως = ὡσαύτως δέ, i.e. πάντα δέκα, tenfold (8. 21. 5).

82. 1. **λέγεται δέ κτλ.**: probably by some author, or λογογράφος; cp. c. 81 *supra*, οὐ λέγεται πρὸς οὐδαμῶν. The specification indicates a doubt of the truth of the following story, which is indeed not *prima facie* very probable, and carries too obvious a tendency and moral.

Ξέρξης φεύγων. Xerxes is seldom allowed to leave Hellas except 'in flight.' Here the exaggeration serves to make the bequest of his κατασκευή to Mardonios more probable. The κατασκευή might certainly include the σκηνή (above described, c. 70, as of Mardonios); the παραπετάσματα, hangings, curtains, tapestries, as well as παρασκευή lower down, support that view; but if the Tegeatai had sacked it on entering the camp, how could Pausanias have seen it in the good order implied by the present story? According to Plutarch, *Perikles* 13 (cp. Pausanias 1. 20. 4), the Oideion was said to have been a copy of the king's tent (εἰκὼν καὶ μίμημα τῆς βασιλέως σκήνης). Vitruvius 5. 9 represents the roof as constructed from the masts and spars of the Persian ships, and names Themistokles as the (first?) erector. (On the subsequent fate of the building cp. Frazer, *Pausan. l.c.*; E. Gardner, *Ancient Athens*, pp. 394–5.) That looks as though the king's pavilion had fallen into the hands of the Athenians, a conclusion hardly compatible with c. 70 above. Or did the adoption of that pattern cover a protest or claim?

5. **ἀρτοκόπους . . ὀψοποιούς**: cp. Xenoph. *Hell.* 7. 1. 38 (report of the Arkadian Antiochos to the *Myriad*, 367 B.C.) ὅτι βασιλεὺς ἀρτοκόπους μὲν καὶ ὀψοποιοὺς καὶ οἰνοχόους καὶ θυρωροὺς παμπληθεῖς ἔχοι, ἄνδρας δὲ οἳ μάχοιντ' ἂν Ἕλλησι, πάνυ ζητῶν οὐκ ἔφη δύνασθαι ἰδεῖν. Hdt. makes ἀρτοκόπος feminine in 1. 51. The males had not all been put to the sword at Plataia; cp. c. 81 *supra* (γυναῖκες). ὀψοποιός is not a pastry-cook (μάγειρος, at least originally) but a cook for ὄψα, *q.v.*

6. **καθώς** is anomalous; cp. App. Crit. It occurs *ap.* Athenaeum 138 C, in quoting this very passage.

10. **ἐκπλαγέντα**, whether of fear, or

ἑωυτοῦ διηκόνους παρασκευάσαι Λακωνικὸν δεῖπνον. ὡς δὲ τῆς θοίνης ποιηθείσης ἦν πολλὸν τὸ μέσον, τὸν Παυσανίην γελάσαντα μεταπέμψασθαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς στρατηγούς, συνελθόντων δὲ τούτων εἰπεῖν τὸν Παυσανίην, δεικνύντα ἐς ἑκατέρην τοῦ δείπνου παρασκευήν, "ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, τῶνδε εἵνεκα ἐγὼ ὑμέας συνήγαγον, βουλόμενος ὑμῖν τοῦδε τοῦ Μήδων ἡγεμόνος τὴν ἀφροσύνην δέξαι, ὃς τοιήνδε δίαιταν ἔχων ἦλθε ἐς ἡμέας οὕτω ὀιζυρὴν ἔχοντας ἀπαιρησόμενος." ταῦτα μὲν Παυσανίην λέγεται εἰπεῖν πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων. ὑστέρῳ μέντοι χρόνῳ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ τῶν **83**
Πλαταιέων εὗρον συχνοὶ θήκας χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων χρημάτων. ἐφάνη δὲ καὶ τάδε ὕστερον ἔτι τούτων

---

14 *τουτέων* **B**C*z* || *εἶπαι z*, van H. || *τὸν Παυσανίην* secl. van H. || *ἐς* om. **B** 15 *τὴν παρασκευὴν* **B**, Holder, van H. 16 *ὑμέας ἐγὼ* Marc. || *ἡμῖν* **B** || *τοῦδε τοῦ* : *τοῦ τοῦ* V : *τοῦ* RS, Holder, van H. 17 *Μήδου* S : (*ἡγεμόνος* deleto) Schaefer, Palm : *βασιλῆος z* || *δεῖξαι* libri 18 *οὕτως* **B** 19 *παυσανίης* RS || *εἶπαι z*, van H. **83.** 3 *ἐφάνη* . . *ἐτάφη* (c. 84) ut spuria secl. Krueger || *τάδε ὕστερον ἔτι τούτων* <*ἐπὶ*> Stein[3] : *τόδε ὕστερον τούτων ἐπὶ* Stein[2] : *τόδε ὕστερον ἐπὶ τούτων* libri (*τουτέων z*), Stein[1] : *τόδε ὕστερον ἔτι τούτων.* Abresch, Wesseling, Holder, van H.

---

astonishment, as here, is more usually constructed with the dative; cp. 7. 226, 4. 4, etc.

ἐπὶ γέλωτι, of the end or object in view; cp. 6. 67. Pausanias should be credited with a more serious purpose; but the anecdote is a contribution to "the comic Nemesis"; cp. 8. 24. 4 *supra*.

τοὺς ἑωυτοῦ διηκόνους, including the hereditary cooks (6. 60), whose productions were not likely to be triumphs of the culinary art. Athenaeus (4. 16 ff.) 139 follows up his citation of this passage by numerous quotations on various forms of Lakonian banquets, the *κοπίς*, the *αἴκλον*, the *φειδίτια* (e.g. *ἔστι δ' ἡ κοπὶς δεῖπνον, μάζα, ἄρτος, κρέας, λάχανον ὠμόν, ζωμός, σῦκον, τράγημα, θέρμος*).

12. **θοίνη**: food, banquet, 1. 119.

τὸ μέσον, 'the interval,' 'the difference'; cp. Index, and 1. 126.

13. **τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς στρατηγούς**: he might have been going to entertain them, and perhaps he was, to a banquet *à la Perse*. The subsequent career of Pausanias seems to suggest that the Persian cooks made a speedy convert; but here Pride—the Pride of Poverty—prevents his fall. No wonder Hdt. doubts the story (*λέγεται* again), but it was too good a one to throw over. It is apparently an addition, at second or third hand, for it interrupts the natural sequence of cc. 81, 83. Cp. Introduction, § 9.

18. **ὀιζυρός** (only here in Hdt.) is a common Homeric epithet of *πόλεμος, γόος, νύξ*, and *βροτοί* (human beings, most frequently): 'miserable,' woeful, pitiable. A harder epithet could scarcely have been used of the poverty-stricken Laconic fare.

83. 1. **ὑστέρῳ μέντοι . . χρημάτων.** This sentence has nothing to say to the immediately preceding sentence, or chapter; nor does it fit on very well to c. 81. It would follow most naturally immediately on c. 80 *supra*; that is to say, in view of the previous notes, c. 81 looks like an addition 'of the second hand,' and c. 82 like an addition of the second, or third hand. **μέντοι** after *μέν* instead of *δέ*: cp. 6. 86 *ποιέετε μὲν . . ὀκοῖον μέντοι κτλ.*

2. **θήκας**, 'deposits'; the Helots not having been able to dispose of all their thefts to the Aiginetans, had buried many of them in the ground. (The Helots may not have been the only thieves and depositors.)

3. **ἐφάνη δέ κτλ.** Krüger damned the

<ἐπὶ> τῶν νεκρῶν περιψιλωθέντων τὰς σάρκας· συνεφόρεον γὰρ τὰ ὀστέα οἱ Πλαταιέες ἐς ἕνα χῶρον· εὑρέθη κεφαλὴ οὐκ ἔχουσα ῥαφὴν οὐδεμίαν ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἑνὸς ἐοῦσα ὀστέου, ἐφάνη δὲ καὶ γνάθος κατὰ τὸ ἄνω [τῆς γνάθου] ἔχουσα ὀδόντας μουνοφυέας ἐξ ἑνὸς ὀστέου πάντας τούς τε προσθίους καὶ γομφίους,
84 καὶ πενταπήχεος ἀνδρὸς ὀστέα ἐφάνη. ἐπείτε δὲ Μαρδονίου δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ ὁ νεκρὸς ἠφάνιστο, ὑπὸ ὅτευ μὲν ἀνθρώπων τὸ ἀτρεκὲς οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, πολλοὺς δὲ τινὰς ἤδη καὶ

5 ὀστᾶ C   6 οὐδεμίην *z* || ἀλλὰ Marc. *z*   7 κατὰ Stein$^{(1)2}$, van H.: καὶ || ἐπάνω **β**P*z* || τῆς γνάθου del. Stein$^{(1)2}$, Holder, van H. || ὀδόντας secl. van H. || μουνοφυέας . . ὀδόντας (vel προσθίους) om. B[1]: μονοφυέας **β**   8 προσθίους Stein$^{(1)23}$: ὀδόντας || τοὺς γομφίους *z*   9 πεντεπήχεος **α**   84. 1 ἐπεὶ δὲ **β**: ἐπεί γε δὴ malebat Stein^{13}: 'locus et lacunosus et corruptus' Stein[2]   2 ἠφάνισται Paris. 1635 *z* || ὑπ᾽ C Marc.: ὑπό RSV || τευ **β**: ὅτεω *z* || ἀνθρώπου S   3 ἀτρεκέως **β** || εἶπαι *z*, van H. || ἤδη om. S

rest of this and the next chapter. The matter is quite to Hdt.'s mind on such occasions, cp. 3. 12, but these curiosities of the battle-field may be additions of his own; on the other hand, the fate of Mardonios' corpse must have been a primary problem.

ὕστερον τούτων: not strictly after the discovery of the hidden treasures by Plataians, but simply 'after the war'; cp. c. 75 *supra*.

4. **<ἐπὶ> τῶν νεκρῶν περιψιλωθέντων τὰς σάρκας**: the plural *σάρκας* perhaps with reference to the numbers of different dead, but Homer habitually uses the plural, even as *ὀστέα*. The accusative is "of reference"; cp. c. 72 *supra*. **ἐπί** with the genitive here, 'upon the corpses,' can hardly be temporal, though that would give one of the quaintest dates on record ('at, or by, the time the dead bodies were cleaned bare of flesh'); nor even local (the dead bodies having been gathered into one place), but perhaps more generally 'in the case of' (cp. App. Crit.). Hdt. does not say that he had himself seen these curiosities. 1. The skull without a single suture (**ῥαφή**). 2. The jaw (upper) with all the teeth of a piece. **γομφίος** (sc. *ὀδούς*), regular word for 'molars' (**πρόσθιος** 'front'). (Plutarch *Pyrrh.* 3 makes a similar statement of Pyrrhus; Pliny 7. 69 of the son of Prusias of Bithynia.) 3. The bones of a man five cubits high (the tallest of the Persians wanted four fingers of that height, 7. 117 *supra*).

84. 1. **ἐπείτε δέ**: there is no apodosis to this protasis, whether formal or material. Stein suggested *ἐπεί γε δή* on the assumption that the giant corpse, just mentioned, had been mistaken for that of Mardonios; but Hdt. would scarcely have left so much to be understood, and the grammatical confusion of the passage may arise from the amount of 'retractation,' not fully carried through, in the whole of this context. This little c. is altogether significant for the sources and composition problems of Hdt.'s work. Cp. Introduction, § 10.

2. **δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ**: i.e. the day after the battle, or the 14th; the night of the day of battle has not been indicated: the nearest thing thereto is the evening meal ordered in c. 82, if indeed that anecdote belongs to the same day. The dawn of the day of battle has been recorded in c. 56 *supra*.

ὁ νεκρὸς ἠφάνιστο, 'the corpse of Mardonios was nowhere to be found . .' The scandal against Lampon of Aigina, cc. 78 f. *supra*, assumed the recovery of the body as a matter of course. The pl.p. may be taken as strictly temporal.

3. **τὸ ἀτρεκὲς οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν.** Hdt. can hardly have seen the monument to Mardonios on the road from Eleutherai to Plataia mentioned by Pausanias 9. 2. 2, evidently with some hesitation and doubt, due to this very passage in Hdt.

ἤδη . . ἤκουσα: as in 7. 55. Though Hdt. uses *ὁράω* of perceptions not strictly visual (cp. c. 53 *supra*, and

παντοδαποὺς ἤκουσα θάψαι Μαρδόνιον, καὶ δῶρα μεγάλα οἶδα λαβόντας πολλοὺς παρὰ Ἀρτόντεω τοῦ Μαρδονίου παιδὸς διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον· ὅστις μέντοι ἦν αὐτῶν ὁ ὑπελόμενός τε καὶ θάψας τὸν νεκρὸν τὸν Μαρδονίου, οὐ δύναμαι ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι, ἔχει δὲ τινὰ φάτιν καὶ Διονυσοφάνης ἀνὴρ Ἐφέσιος θάψαι Μαρδόνιον. ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μὲν τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ ἐτάφη.

Οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ὡς ἐν Πλαταιῇσι τὴν ληίην διείλοντο, **85**
ἔθαπτον τοὺς ἑωυτῶν χωρὶς ἕκαστοι. Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν

---

6 αὐτέων C Marc. z || ὑπονοούμενος **ß** 7 τοῦ μαρδονίου Marc. 8 φάτις S || διονυσοφάνης **ß** Marc. : διονυσιοφάνης 9 τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ : πρὸς ὁτευδήποτε van H. **85.** 1 πλαταίῃισι **α** : πλαταίῃσι **ß** || διείλαντο **ß**

---

6. 69 ὀρέων δέ με κατομνυμένην κτλ.), he probably uses ἀκούω with definite reference to audible, oral information (not as we, who speak of 'hearing' by letter, etc. The curious passage 1. 124, 125 comes dangerously near our colloquial usage: τὸ βυβλίον . . λαβὼν ἐπελέγετο, τὰ δὲ γράμματα ἔλεγε τάδε . . ἀκούσας ταῦτα ὁ Κῦρος κτλ.). The use of οἶδα just below contrasts not with the uncertainty of hearsay, as though the οἶδα (εἰδέναι) had necessarily some other source, but merely assures us of Hdt.'s personal conviction (cp. 7. 214 οἴδαμεν, 1. 5, 20 etc.), not but what he might have seen the δῶρα, or some of them, or some of the persons who received them, or even Artontes himself, though he never saw the corpse, or even the tomb, of Mardonios.

5. **Ἀρτόντεω**: to be distinguished from the father of Bagaios 3. 124, though possibly of the same house, and named after him. Nothing more is known of Artontes the son of Mardonios; but as in 492 B.C. Mardonios was young and lately married to Artozostra, the daughter of Dareios (cp. 6. 43), Stein ingeniously conjectures that Artontes may have had an official post in Asia Minor about 460 B.C. or later, when these applications were made to him, and his piety so cruelly exploited. Pausanias (9. 2. 2) makes all the successful applicants 'Ionians,' but he may have nothing more to draw on than this story in Hdt. This passage may obviously quite well belong to the earliest draft of Hdt.'s work. Cp. *de Mardonii morte* Nipperdey *ad* Nep. *Arist.* 2. 1; Müller *ad* Aristod. 2. 5 (*F.H.G.* v. p. 5); Enmann, *die Quellen des Trogus*, Dorpat, 1880, p. 23; Krumbholz, p. 26.

6. **ὅστις μέντοι ἦν**: that none of the applications was really genuine or honest, that the body was never identified and buried, are alternatives which Hdt. does not even consider. He assumes that some one secretly got the body away (**ὑπελόμενος**) and buried it. Another and more discreditable alternative has, indeed, been disposed of cc. 78 f. above. The problem evidently exercised Hdt. a good deal (οὐ δύναμαι ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι). That 'burial' was not perhaps quite the proper rule for Persians Hdt. half knows, cp. 1. 140, but the 'Magian' use may not have been as yet universal among 'Persians.' Cp. also 7. 10 *ad f.*

8. **ἔχει δὲ τινὰ φάτιν**: cp. διξοὺς λόγους λεγομένους ἔχει c. 74 *supra*, the reverse construction to λόγος ἔχει (cp. c. 78 *supra*) or φάτις μιν ἔχει 7. 3. φάτις perhaps comes nearer than any single word in Hdt. to 'oral report,' mere hearsay, written down by him for the first time; cp. 7. 3, 189, 8. 94; Introduction, § 10.

Διονυσοφάνης: of this Ephesian nothing is known but what Hdt. tells us. How an Ephesian, how other 'Ionians' came to be on the battle-field of Plataia is anything but obvious: on which side were they supposed to be fighting? Were they prisoners, or slaves? or merchants? or diviners?

85. 1. **διείλοντο, ἔθαπτον**: the sequence of tenses seems to warrant the conclusion, strange as it may appear that the Greeks postponed the burial of their own dead to the division of the spoil.

2. **χωρὶς ἕκαστοι**: each set, each state, its own apart from those of the others.

τριξὰς ἐποιήσαντο θήκας· ἔνθα μὲν τοὺς ἰρένας ἔθαψαν, τῶν καὶ Ποσειδώνιος καὶ Ἀμομφάρετος ἦσαν καὶ Φιλοκύων τε

---

3 *ἔνθα . .* Καλλικράτης secl. Sitzler || *ἰρένας* Valckenaer, Stein, van H.: *εἰρένας* de Pauw, ΛΕΞΕΙΣ: *ιρέας* AB: *ἰρέας* Holder: *ἱερέας* Marc.: *ἱρέας* reliqui || *τῶν καὶ*: *τῶν* **B** Marc. 4 *ποσειδόνιος* R || *ἦσαν* post *Ποσειδώνιος* S: *ἔσαν* z

---

Pausanias 9. 2. 5 locates the tombs on the road, after the junction of the routes from Eleutherai and from Megara, and just at the entrance to the city: *κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἔσοδον μάλιστα τὴν ἐς Πλάταιαν τάφοι τῶν πρὸς Μήδους μαχεσαμένων εἰσί.* Such is the precision of the actual *Periegete*; but even he has not quite accurately described the tombs themselves: *τοῖς μὲν οὖν λοιποῖς ἐστὶν Ἕλλησι μνῆμα κοινόν.* If this is correct, the statement of Hdt. below in regard to the tombs of the Tegeatai, of the Megarians and Phleiasians, to say nothing of the alleged kenotaphs, must be incorrect. Blakesley suggests that Pausanias mistook the barrow of the Helots for 'the common sepulture of all the Greeks.' Or was it the Megaro-Phleiasian? Pausanias proceeds: *Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναίων τοῖς πεσοῦσιν ἰδίᾳ τέ εἰσιν οἱ τάφοι, καὶ ἐλεγεῖά ἐστι Σιμωνίδου γεγραμμένα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.* Pausanias unfortunately does not quote the epigrams; for possible texts cp. Hauvette, *sur l'authenticité* etc., Nos. 28, 29. Dr. Frazer is doubtless right in declining to see in the rock-cut graves, a little SE. of the plateau of the city, any remains of the *θῆκαι*, *χώματα*, or *πολυάνδρια* which contained the bodies of the slain in 479 B.C., *Pausanias*, v. p. 15.

Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέν. The Lakedaimonians made them three graves, or tombs, **τριξὰς θήκας**, or as Dr. Frazer *l.c.*, harmonizing Pausanias with Hdt., suggests, a triple grave, a common receptacle for three groups of dead men. That is, indeed, very probably what they did; but Hdt. speaks of three *τάφοι* for the Lakedaimonians, in each of which a separate group is deposited, and, though the *τάφοι* may not be *χωρίς*, they appear to be quite distinct. If Hdt. is mistaken on this point, it is not the only mistake he makes in this passage. *τριξός*, as in 4. 192.

3. **τοὺς ἰρένας**: a conjecture by Valckenaer for *ἰρέας*, but a certain one. The *Λέξεις* contains the word *εἰρήν* (cp. Stein *ed. maj.* ii. 465), but this is the only place in the text where it can occur; the burial of *ἰρέες* by themselves is inadmissible, and who were the *ἰρέες*? So great an error in Greek or Spartan institutions Hdt. could not incur. The *ἰρήν* (*ἴρην*, *εἴρην*, *ἴραν*, *Fίραν*) was the Spartiate warrior from twenty to thirty years of age, Plutarch, *Lyk.* 17; cp. G. Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* i.[2] 70; but it is not credible that Spartan citizens of that age occupied high military or civil posts, nor is it credible that Poseidonios, Amompharetos, Philokyon (cp. c. 71 *supra*), and Kallikrates (cp. c. 72 *supra*) were merely *ἴρανες*, least of all Amompharetos. Neither is it to be admitted (with L. & S. *sub v.*) that the word in this passage denotes 'officers of all ranks'; the glosses in Hesychios (*ἰρένες· οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡλικιωτῶν* and *εἰρηνάζει· κρατεῖ*) do not go beyond Plutarch *l.c.* *οὗτος οὖν ὁ εἴρην εἰκόσι ἔτη γεγονὼς ἄρχει τε τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων ἐν ταῖς μάχαις καὶ κατ' οἶκον ὑπηρέταις χρῆται πρὸς τὸ δεῖπνον.* (Plutarch may be following 'Aristotle' *Λακ. πολιτεία*.) Rawlinson's assertion that 'at the age of twenty the Spartiate acquired the right to speak in the Assembly and to have a command' is a bit of constitutional lore due to combining the pseudo-etymology (*εἴρην* from *ἐρέω*) in *Etym. Mag.* with the misunderstanding of the gloss of Hesychios above cited. It appears that Hdt., though he employs the technical term *ἰρένες*, has not understood it when he puts the *ἰρένες* in one grave, 'the rest of the Spartiates' in another, and the Helots in a third. That arrangement, indeed, takes no account of the 'Lakedaimonians,' or Perioikoi. Probably the three trenches, or mounds, covered (i.) Spartiates—a majority of whom would be *ἰράνες*, (ii.) Lakedaimonians, (iii.) Helots. Of the first, ninety-one had fallen, c. 70 *supra*; the figures for the others are not given. The error shown in the passage makes it unlikely that Hdt. derived this passage from a Spartan source, least of all one in Sparta itself.

καὶ Καλλικράτης. *ἐν μὲν δὴ ἐνὶ τῶν τάφων ἦσαν οἱ ἰρένες, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ οἱ ἄλλοι Σπαρτιῆται, ἐν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ οἱ εἵλωτες. οὗτοι μὲν οὕτω ἔθαπτον,* Τεγεῆται *δὲ χωρὶς πάντας ἀλέας, καὶ* Ἀθηναῖοι *τοὺς ἑωυτῶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ* Μεγαρέες *τε καὶ* Φλειάσιοι *τοὺς ὑπὸ τῆς ἵππου διαφθαρέντας. τούτων μὲν δὴ πάντων πλήρεες ἐγένοντο οἱ τάφοι· τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ὅσοισι καὶ φαίνονται ἐν* Πλαταιῇσι *ἐόντες τάφοι, τούτους δέ, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, ἐπαισχυνομένους τῇ ἀπεστοῖ τῆς μάχης ἑκάστους χώματα χῶσαι κεινὰ τῶν ἐπιγινομένων εἵνεκεν ἀνθρώπων,*

5 *ἦσαν*: *ἐτάφησαν*? Stein(2) || *ἰρένες* Valckenaer etc.: *εἰρένες* ut supra: *ιρέες* AB: *ἰρέες* Holder: *ἱερέες* Marc.: *ἱρέες* ceteri 7 *οὕτω μὲν οὗτοι ἔθαφθεν* **β** || *πάντας ἔθαψαν* **β**z 8 *αλέας* AB: *ἀλέας* Marc. || *τοὺς ἑωυτῶν ὁμοῦ* om. **β** 9 *τουτέων* C Marc. z 10 *τῶν . . τάφοι* om. **β**: citat Plutarch. *Mor.* 872 || *ὅσοισι* Krueger, Stein[3]: *ὅσοι* 11 *πλαταίῃσι* AB || *δὴ* z 12 *ἀπαισχυνομένους* **a**C: *ἀπεσχοινισμένους* Marc. || *ἀποεστοῖ* R (**β** ap. Holder: *ἀποστοὶ τῆς μάχης ἐγένοντο* S ap. Gaisford): *ἀπεστύϊ* coni. Valckenaer || *ἑκάστη* Marc. 13 *κοινὰ* Paris. 1635 z || *ἐπιγεινομένων* **a**C || *εἵνεκα* z

7. **Τεγεῆται.** The Tegeatai buried their sixteen (c. 70 *supra*) all together, in a separate place, and grave, probably next the Lakedaimonians (cp. c. 28 *supra*). Pausanias does not notice the Tegean grave.

8. **Ἀθηναῖοι** had fifty-two slain (c. 70 *supra*). One might have expected them to have buried their dead down on the plain, where, presumably, they had fallen (c. 67 *supra*), but Pausanias *l.c.* appears to put the grave in the neighbourhood of the Spartan. (Could he have made a mistake?) Stein sees in Thucydides 2. 34. 5 an intentional contradiction of this passage in Hdt. Krüger proposed to reconcile the two by supposing that the Athenian tomb at Plataia was a kenotaph; Baehr boldly regards Thucydides as in the wrong.

Μεγαρέες τε καὶ Φλειάσιοι. This formula denotes the left centre of the Greek army (cp. c. 69 *supra*), and probably only one grave or *Polyandrion* is here indicated, in which those of the right centre, who fell in conflict with the Thebans, were interred, to the number of 600; cp. c. 69 *supra*. That figure is not, indeed, convincing. It should perhaps be taken to represent the total losses of the Greeks other than the figures for the Lakedaimonians, Tegeatai, and Athenians, in fact to cover also the losses of the right centre of the Greek army (which Hdt. appears to think was not engaged at all). If so, then this tumulus is the first of the *τάφοι* described by Pausanias, the *μνῆμα κοινόν* for all the Greeks (i.e. the whole centre), distinguished from the separate *τάφοι* for the Lakedaimonians and for the Athenians.

10. **τῶν δὲ ἄλλων**: sc. Ἑλλήνων.

11. **φαίνονται ἐν Πλαταιῇσι ἐόντες**, 'are to be seen at Plataia,' i.e. in the land of Plataia (cp. c. 16 etc.). It does not follow that Hdt. had seen them before writing; indeed, what ensues is based on hearsay, or correspondence (*πυνθάνομαι, ἀκούω*); and, if Hdt. had been writing from his own personal inspection and remembrance, the imperfect tense would have been more naturally employed (*ἐφαίνοντο*).

τούτους δέ: a true *δέ in apodosi*; *τούτους* is better referred to *τάφοι* than to *τῶν ἄλλων*, and taken as in virtual opposition to *χώματα, ἑκάστους* (the several states) being subject of the verb. There is still a slight confusion in the construction, which is in *oratio obliqua*, the *ὡς* in *ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι* notwithstanding.

12. **ἀπεστοῖ** = *ἀπουσίᾳ*. Hesychios gives the form *ἀπεστύς* as well as *ἀπεστώ*, Ionic forms. Cp. *εὐεστώ* 1. 85. **τῆς μάχης**, on the 13th.

13. **τῶν ἐπιγινομένων εἵνεκεν**, 'for the sake of (deceiving) posterity'!

ἐπεὶ καὶ Αἰγινητέων ἐστὶ αὐτόθι καλεόμενος τάφος, τὸν ἐγὼ ἀκούω καὶ δέκα ἔτεσι ὕστερον μετὰ ταῦτα δεηθέντων τῶν Αἰγινητέων χῶσαι Κλεάδην τὸν Αὐτοδίκου ἄνδρα Πλαταιέα, πρόξεινον ἐόντα αὐτῶν.

86 Ὡς δ' ἄρα ἔθαψαν τοὺς νεκροὺς ἐν Πλαταιῇσι οἱ Ἕλληνες, αὐτίκα βουλευομένοισί σφι ἐδόκεε στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ

14 τὸν : τῶν R(V) 15 τῶν om. **β**Pz, Holder 16 ἀλεάδην **α**C Marc. 17 πρόξενον **β** || ὄντα C || ἑωϋτῶν z **86.** 1 δὲ R(V) || πλαταίῃισι **α** : πλαταίῃσιν R(V) 2 βουλομένοισί σφιν C || στρατεύειν **α**C

14. **καὶ Αἰγινητέων** : a particular case but an unfortunate one to have selected, as upon Hdt.'s own showing the Aiginetans, being included in the left centre, *οἱ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας τε καὶ Φλειασίους*, were at least engaged with the Theban cavalry on the 13th. Cp. cc. 69, 28 *supra.* If they erected subsequently a kenotaph (*χῶμα κεινόν* or *τάφος κεινός*), it might be because their actual dead had been interred in the common grave, the 'Megaro-Phleiasian' grave, or *κοινὸν μνῆμα*, and they wished, as time went on, to commemorate their own separately. A similar consideration would account for any other kenotaphs on the field.

ἐγὼ ἀκούω : not very convincing evidence, nor very critically received by Hdt. The use of the present is perhaps rhetorical, or is he writing in Athens, where he would be hearing such things said? Cp. Introduction, § 10.

15. **καὶ δέκα ἔτεσι ὕστερον μετὰ ταῦτα**, 'as much as ten years subsequently after the war' (*καί etiam*); i.e. in 469 B.C. For *μετὰ ταῦτα* cp. c. 83 *supra.* (Plutarch *de malig. Hdti* 42 = *Mor.* 873 paraphrases *ἔτεσι δέκα ὕστερον τῶν Μηδικῶν.*) As the dative of time marks a point, the date here given must be meant to be exact.

16. **Κλεάδην τὸν Αὐτοδίκου** : only mentioned again in Plutarch *l.c.* quoting this passage. The name Kleades is known at Sparta and Argos; the name Autodikos only elsewhere at Athens (cp. Pape-Benseler *sub vv.*). As *πρόξεινος* of the Aiginetans this Plataian might not be a very popular person in Athens, whence Hdt. directly or indirectly 'heard' this scandal. Plutarch *l.c.* makes one of his bitter points against Hdt. *à propos* of these kenotaphs; yet, like most of his arguments, it is wide of the mark. The 'trophies and colossi' on which the names were inscribed were commemorative of the war rather than of the particular battle of Plataia (on the 13th); moreover, as above shown, there might be kenotaphs on the field of battle in honour of warriors buried elsewhere. On the *προξενία* cp. 8. 136, 143.

86. 1. **ἄρα** : if the word is to suggest an element of the unexpected, the note of admiration may in this case arride the place of sepulture, to most even of the Greek dead a foreign land; cp. 1. 30. But what became of the 237,000 corpses, more or less, of the enemies, with which Hdt. has bestrown the field in c. 70 *supra* : are they covered by this notice? In which case the surprise might extend to the numbers.

2. **αὐτίκα βουλευομένοισί σφι ἐδόκεε** : here is the record, or the hint, of a deliberation, a council, which issues in a resolution to 'visit' Thebes. Ought the record in Plutarch *Aristeid.* 21 of the treaty of Plataia, or the revision of the confederate articles and the institution of the *Eleutheria*, to be inserted here? Grote (iv. 282) seems to date it to "a general and solemn meeting, held at Plataia after the victory," but also apparently dates that meeting after the surrender of Thebes. Plutarch omits the Theban incident altogether, and there is no room below for any other congress or meeting at Plataia after the surrender of Thebes. If, then, the meeting which carried the psephism of Aristeides was held at Plataia, it would be the meeting here imperfectly reported; but perhaps the psephism of Aristeides, if ever carried at all, was carried at a congress at the Isthmos, for which room may be found in c. 88 *infra.* Grote defends the authenticity of the psephism of Aristeides, but the story, as told by

τὰς Θήβας καὶ ἐξαιτέειν αὐτῶν τοὺς μηδίσαντας, ἐν πρώτοισι δὲ αὐτῶν Τιμηγενίδην καὶ Ἀτταγῖνον, οἳ ἀρχηγέται ἀνὰ πρώτους ἦσαν· ἢν δὲ μὴ ἐκδιδῶσι, μὴ ἀπανίστασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλιος πρότερον ἢ ἐξέλωσι. ὡς δέ σφι ταῦτα ἔδοξε, οὕτω δὴ ἑνδεκάτῃ ἡμέρῃ ἀπὸ τῆς συμβολῆς ἀπικόμενοι ἐπολιόρκεον Θηβαίους, κελεύοντες ἐκδιδόναι τοὺς ἄνδρας· οὐ βουλομένων δὲ τῶν Θηβαίων ἐκδιδόναι, τήν τε γῆν αὐτῶν ἔταμνον καὶ προσέβαλλον πρὸς τὸ τεῖχος.
καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἐπαύοντο σινόμενοι, **87**
εἰκοστῇ ἡμέρῃ ἔλεξε τοῖσι Θηβαίοισι Τιμηγενίδης τάδε.

3, 4 *αὐτέων* z (bis): *ἀστέων* prior. l. Koen 4 *αὐτῶν* abesse malit van H. || *ἀττατῖνον* P 5 *ἔσαν* z || *ἀπὸ . . ἐξέλωσι* om. **B** 7 *ἐνδεκάτηι* C 9 *τῶν Θηβαίων* 'abesse poterat' van H. || *αὐτέων* z 10 *προσέβαλον* S Marc. **87.** 1 *σινεόμενοι* **B**

Plutarch, is not confirmed by Thucydides 2. 71, for (*a*) nothing is there said of the renewal or extension of the military confederacy ; (*b*) the privileges accorded the Plataians are granted by Pausanias at a meeting of the allies in the Agora of Plataia. This grant might very well have been made at the meeting here recorded. Grote hardly showed his normal sagacity in accepting the story of the psephism of Aristeides and at the same time rejecting the story of the quarrel over the Aristeia (which certainly ill squares with it !).

3. **ἐξαιτέειν αὐτῶν τοὺς μηδίσαντας.** If the story told in 7. 132 of the vow in the previous year against the medizers were true, the resolution now formally taken, to demand the extradition of the traitors among the Thebans, would appear both mild and superfluous : a reason the more for doubting the truth of that story. But again, this resolution recognizes very clearly the existence of two parties in Thebes, the medizing party being evidently the Equestrians, not the Hoplites ; cp. c. 69 *supra* and 7. 223.

The reading *ἀστέων* out of *αὐτέων* for *αὐτῶν* is attractive : a second *αὐτῶν* (sc. *τῶν μηδισάντων*) comes immediately, and there is no proper personal antecedent for *αὐτῶν* here. Cp. App. Crit.

4. **Τιμηγενίδην** : cp. c. 38 *supra*.

Ἀτταγῖνον : cp. c. 16 *supra*. The absence of the patronymics in this place seems to show that the previous descriptions of the men are present to the author's mind, though there is no express reference back to the earlier passages. Hdt. writes for a reading public ; and all three passages apparently belong to the first draft of his work.

ἀρχηγέται ἀνὰ πρώτους. The use of *ἀνά* is not easy to parallel, and *πρώτους* is awkward after *ἐν πρώτοισι* just before, and slightly tautologous with *ἀρχ-ηγέται*, i.e. *ἡγέται ἀνὰ πρώτους*, or *ἐν πρώτοις*. The term *ἀρχηγέται* is a word of exceptional dignity applicable to gods (Thuc. 6. 3), heroes (*Ἀθ. πολ.* 21. 6), kings (Plutarch, *Lyk.* 6), and founders (Pind. *Ol.* 7. 143) ; so too Inscripp. How comes Hdt. to apply it to these Theban traitors ? Did he get it of Thersander ? cp. c. 16 *supra*. It is an hapaxlegomenon in Hdt., though the verb is used 2. 123.

6. **πρότερον ἢ ἐξέλωσι** : sc. *αὐτήν*. The subjunctive without *ἄν* is observable ; cp. c. 117 *infra*, also 7. 8 *οὐ πρότερον παύσομαι πρὶν ἢ ἕλω τε καὶ πυρώσω τὰς Ἀθήνας*, c. 93 *infra* *οὐ πρότερόν τε παύσεσθαι τιμωρέοντες ἐκείνῳ πρὶν ἢ δίκας δῶσι*. Cp. also c. 87 just below.

7. **ἑνδεκάτῃ ἡμέρῃ.** Is this the 23rd or the 24th reckoning continuously ? The answer depends on whether **ἀπό** is exclusive or inclusive. It might naturally be the former ; but the *δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ* in c. 84 *supra* is the day after the battle. In any case we have here merely another of Hdt.'s weeks, or 'ten-days' ; cp. c. 8 *supra* and the next chapter here. The 11th day begins a fresh week.

συμβολῆς, c. 77 *supra*, etc.

ἐπολιόρκεον Θηβαίους : the tense is strictly imperfect, 'they made as though to besiege—they were for besieging . .' *Θηβαίους = τὰς Θήβας*.

87. 2. **εἰκοστῇ ἡμέρῃ** : probably not of the siege, but *ἀπὸ τῆς συμβολῆς* as just

"ἄνδρες Θηβαῖοι, ἐπειδὴ οὕτω δέδοκται τοῖσι Ἕλλησι, μὴ πρότερον ἀπαναστῆναι πολιορκέοντας ἢ ἐξέλωσι Θήβας ἢ ἡμέας αὐτοῖσι παραδῶτε, νῦν ὦν ἡμέων εἵνεκα γῆ ἡ Βοιωτίη πλέω μὴ αναπλήσῃ, ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν χρημάτων χρηίζοντες πρόσχημα ἡμέας ἐξαιτέονται, χρήματά σφι δῶμεν ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ (σὺν γὰρ τῷ κοινῷ καὶ ἐμηδίσαμεν οὐδὲ μοῦνοι ἡμεῖς), εἰ δὲ ἡμέων ἀληθέως δεόμενοι πολιορκέουσι, ἡμεῖς ἡμέας αὐτοὺς ἐς ἀντιλογίην παρέξομεν." κάρτα τε ἔδοξε εὖ λέγειν καὶ ἐς καιρόν, αὐτίκα τε ἐπεκηρυκεύοντο πρὸς Παυσανίην οἱ Θηβαῖοι

---

3 *οὕτω* : *οὔτε* S 4 *πρὶν ἢ* z 5 *ἡμέας παραδότε* **B** || *βοιωτίηι* B 6 *πλέω* om. S || *ἀνατλήσῃ* z || *εἰ* : *ἢ* B : *ἢν* **B** || *χρηίζοντες* P : *χρήζοντες* R(V) : *χρῄζοντες* z 7 *ἐξαιτέωνται* **B** 8 *οὐ δὴ μοῦνοι ἡμέες* z 9 *ἀληθῶς* Marc. || *ἡμεῖς* <*δὲ*> Krueger, van H. || *ἑωυτοὺς* z || *εἰς* R(V), Holder 10 *εὖ* om. Marc.

---

above; it would then be the 10th day of the siege, the last day of the 'week,' which begins with the 11th day just above. (It would be the 33rd day of the whole journal—if the figures were to be treated as quite exact; cp. cc. 84, 56, 52, 47, 44, 41, *supra*.)

3. **οὕτω** refers here to what follows and = *ὧδε*. Cp. Index.

δέδοκται τοῖσι Ἕλλησι: a formal *δόγμα*, repeated from c. 86 above.

5. **νῦν ὦν** *in apodosi* is unusual.

ἡμέων εἵνεκα, 'for our sakes,' or 'so far as we are concerned . .'

γῆ ἡ Βοιωτίη: treated as equivalent to *τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν* just above.

6. **πλέω μὴ ἀναπλήσῃ**, "dehortative conjunctive in 3rd person" (Stein); cp. 7. 107 *μὴ νῦν οὕτω γένηται.*

πρόσχημα (cp. 4. 167) might be appositive to *ἡμέας* but is better understood as an adverbial accusative, contrasted with *ἀληθέως* just below; cp. *πρόφασιν* 5. 33, also *ἀρχήν*, *τέλος*, etc.

7. **ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ . . σὺν τῷ κοινῷ** are used in different senses, which might be preserved by using our word 'commonwealth.' For the first sense cp. 7. 144; for the second 8. 135. The juristic principle here asserted by this oligarchic traitor is of considerable interest, viz. that the individual citizen cannot be held responsible for the common fault, the crime or error of the community, even though he himself be its author or proposer. It is a plausible maxim, which easily lends itself to sophistry; its employment shows a considerable development of political reflexion. In the present case we are not informed whether there had been a formal vote of *ἄνδρες Θηβαῖοι* in favour of medism, or whether the public medism is treated *de facto*; there was at any rate an opposition, and an opposition, which, if the Theban speaker *ap.* Thuc. 3. 62. 3 is to be trusted, was numerically a majority, though impotent. On this ground Pausanias 9. 6. 2 acquits the Commons: *τῆς δὲ αἰτίας ταύτης δημοσίᾳ σφίσιν οὐ μέτεστιν, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς Θήβαις ὀλιγαρχία καὶ οὐχὶ ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία τηνικαῦτα ἴσχυεν.* He adds that if the Persians had invaded Hellas in the days of Peisistratos, the Athenians would have incurred the reproach of medism. The rider is disputable; but in any case the Athenians, among whom the convenient principle of the political scapegoat was only too well understood, would have made short work of the arguments of a Timagenidas.

9. **ἡμέων ἀληθέως δεόμενοι**, 'because they really want to get hold of us'—or perhaps, 'if the demand for us is the true cause of the siege.'

ἐς ἀντιλογίην παρέξομεν, 'we will give ourselves up to be tried' (Blakesley); or rather, to reply to the charge. No doubt a juristic trial is contemplated; *ἀντιλογίη* in itself only means 'contradiction,' cp. 8. 77, but it comes to be used for reply, defence to objections or charges, controversy, discussion; cp. Thuc. 1. 31. 4, 1. 73. 1, 2. 87. 3. On the showing of this passage the surrender of the men should have been conditional. Cp. next chapter *ad f.*

θέλοντες ἐκδιδόναι τοὺς ἄνδρας. ὡς δὲ ὡμολόγησαν ἐπὶ 88 τούτοισι, Ἀτταγῖνος μὲν ἐκδιδρήσκει ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος, παῖδας δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπαχθέντας Πανσανίης ἀπέλυσε τῆς αἰτίης, φὰς τοῦ μηδισμοῦ παῖδας οὐδὲν εἶναι μεταιτίους. τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐξέδοσαν οἱ Θηβαῖοι, οἳ μὲν ἐδόκεον ἀντιλογίης τε κυρήσειν καὶ δὴ χρήμασι ἐπεποίθεσαν διωθέεσθαι· ὃ δὲ ὡς

---

88. 2 ἀττατῖνος Apr.P || ἐκ : ἐπὶ C   3 αὐτοῦ om. **B**   5 τοὺς : οὓς **a**C Marc.   6 κηρήσιν R : κηρύσειν Marc. || ἐπεπύθεον **a** : ἐπεπόθεον C Marc. : ἐπεπείθεσαν Paris. 1635 z || διώσασθαι **B** : σωθήσεσθαι Cobet, van H. (‘nisi forte mavis διώσεσθαι τὴν αἰτίην simileve quid’ idem) : διαδύσεσθαι ? Stein[5] || ὃ δὲ ὡς **B**Pz, Stein[1], van H. : ὡς δὲ

---

88. 1. **ὡμολόγησαν ἐπὶ τούτοισι.** The terms upon which (ἐπί) Thebes surrendered cannot have been confined to the extradition of Timagenidas, Attaginos, and a few others; the depression of Thebes for the next twenty years could hardly be accounted for on that hypothesis. The ὁμολογία must have included further terms: the break-up of the Boiotian confederacy, the ‘autonomy’ of the Boiotian cities, the overthrow of Theban hegemony, possibly some revision of the Theban constitution itself, possibly a fine. Nothing exhibits the position of affairs during the period so well as the coinage of Boiotia; cp. B. Head, *Coins of Boiotia* (1881) pp. 20 ff., *Hist. Num.* (1887) pp. 291 ff., while the occasion and rationale of the Spartan expedition of 457 B.C. (cp. c. 35 *supra*) supplies an argument *e contrario.*

3. **Πανσανίης ἀπέλυσε**: another tribute to the magnanimity of the Spartan general, unqualified by any insinuation of bribery or corruption. In thus distinguishing between the guilt of various members of one family, and refusing to hold the children responsible for the father's crimes, Pausanias exhibits an advance upon the good old morality of the fable *ex hypothesi* related by his contemporary Leotychidas at Athens some ten years earlier; cp. 6. 86. Baehr extols *Pausaniae animum vere sublimem et a . . superbia . . alienum.* Blakesley remarks that Attaginos was at large, and therefore formidable, and suspects Pausanias of medism already! We may be content to note the hint of a growing consciousness of individual responsibility, proper to an age of reflexion and liberty.

4. **τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἄνδρας**: the omission of their number and names, the anomaly of the grammatical construction, the violence of the proceeding itself, all point to an unresolved problem behind this passage. The anacoluthon may be softened by referring **οἳ μέν** to οἱ Θηβαῖοι, but the historical situation is not thereby lightened.

5. **ἐδόκεον ἀντιλογίης τε κυρήσειν**, ‘were expecting to be put on trial,’ or, to be called upon for a defence; Blakesley renders ἀντ. “pleadings on each side.” The τε should naturally follow the verb, and relates to **καὶ δὴ . . ἐπεποίθεσαν.** The 2nd perf. πέποιθα serves as “present middle” (Veitch, *Gk. Verbs sub v. Il.* 4. 325 etc. “rare in Attic prose,” *Thuc.* 2. 42. 4 ἐλπίδι μὲν τὸ ἀφανὲς τοῦ κατορθώσειν ἐπιτρέψαντες, ἔργῳ δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἤδη ὁρωμένου σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἀξιοῦντες πεποιθέναι), and the pl.p. as an imperfect.

6. **διωθέεσθαι**: the word has caused the commentators trouble; the use of the present is anomalous, and there is no clear object expressed. For suggested emendations cp. App. Crit. Baehr supplies τὴν αἰτίην out of the preceding, i.e. *crimen pecuniis amoliri.*

The verb διωθέεσθαι is used 4. 102 (τὸν Δαρείου στρατὸν ἰθυμαχίῃ διώσασθαι) simply as a strengthened form of ὠθέεσθαι (cp. c. 25 *supra*), and so in Demosthenes 21. 124 (διεωσάμην . . ψευδῆ λόγον καὶ συκοφαντίαν), but also ‘to push through,’ to push apart, to break one's way through, as in c. 102 *infra* διωσάμενοι γὰρ τὰ γέρρα. Might it not here be used, without an object, in an absolute way: ‘to push their way through,’ ‘to pull through’ (as we say), i.e. to get off? (The anomaly of the present is eased a little by referring οἳ μέν to οἱ Θηβαῖοι, who then believed the men were making their escape by means of bribery.)

παρέλαβε, αὐτὰ ταῦτα ὑπονοέων τὴν στρατιὴν τὴν τῶν συμμάχων ἅπασαν ἀπῆκε καὶ ἐκείνους ἀγαγὼν ἐς Κόρινθον διέφθειρε. ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἐν Πλαταιῇσι καὶ Θήβῃσι γενόμενα.

89 Ἀρτάβαζος δὲ ὁ Φαρνάκεος φεύγων ἐκ Πλαταιέων καὶ δὴ

7 τὴν τῶν : τῶν Marc. 9 πλαταίῃισι **α** : πλαταίῃσι R : πλαταίῃσιν V || γινόμενα z **89.** 1 καὶ δὴ : καὶ δὴ καὶ Marc., Gaisford

ὡς παρέλαβε : sc. *αὐτούς*, i.e. *τοὺς ἄνδρας παραλαβών*.

7. **αὐτὰ ταῦτα ὑπονοέων**, 'suspecting (cp. *ὑπονοήσαντες* c. 99 *infra*) their intentions,' or 'just that very course.'

τὴν στρατιὴν . . ἅπασαν ἀπῆκε. Pausanias may have disbanded, or dismissed to their homes, from Thebes, the Athenians, and perhaps the Aiginetans, and one or two other contingents; but it is very unlikely that the rest of the allied forces will have been disbanded at Thebes, or before reaching the Isthmos. There appears to be a tendency in this passage, i.e. in the source followed by Hdt. for the story, to make Pausanias himself wholly and solely responsible for the execution of (Timagenidas and) the anonymous Theban *dévoués* (was Asopodoros, c. 69 *supra*, among them? was Leontiades, 7. 233 ?). They are not tried by a Spartan court (like the Plataians for 'atticism' in 427 B.C., Thuc. 3. 52–68), nor brought before a jury of the allies; Pausanias puts them to death out of hand. This appears to be a very arbitrary proceeding, just such as might be ascribed to him after his fall, at a time when various parties might be glad to wash their hands, at his expense, of anti-Theban conduct. Blakesley goes a long step further in damning the memory of Pausanias: he accepts this story just as it stands, for the facts, and suggests, as the explanation, that Pausanias had been already intriguing with the Persians, and "put the Theban oligarchs to death in order to conceal the evidence which they might have given against him, had they been brought to trial." But then Blakesley (with Ktesias) also believed that the battle of Plataia took place before the battle of Salamis, and was quite a small and trifling affair (virtually, indeed, a defeat for the Greeks). It is at least possible that the Theban prisoners were duly, or at least *pro forma*, put upon their trial at the Isthmos, and that this was indeed one of the conditions of their surrender (*ἡμεῖς ἡμέας αὐτοὺς ἐς ἀντιλογίην παρέξομεν*): Pausanias merely executed the sentence of the court.

8. **ἐς Κόρινθον** = *ἐς τὴν Κορινθιάδα*, cp. c. 17 *supra*, probably an inaccuracy for *ἐς τὸν Κορινθίων Ἰσθμόν*, cp. 7. 195. There was probably a meeting, perhaps a final meeting, of the allies, at which the awards were made, offerings voted, immunities conferred, and the alliance perhaps reconstituted; cp. 8. 123 and c. 85 *supra*.

89. 1. **Ἀρτάβαζος δὲ ὁ Φαρνάκεος.** This narrative is resumed from c. 66 *supra*. Hdt.'s partiality for the patronymic in the case of 'Artabazos son of Pharnakes' is remarkable; he gives it in 7. 66, 8. 126, 9. 41, 66, and here, five times in all; in fact there are only three places, and those all in this Book, viz. cc. 58, 70, 77, where the name is introduced in anything like a fresh connexion without it: the first place is in a speech by Mardonios; in the other two, where the historian writes *propria persona*, the reference to the immediate context is so slight and so obvious (*τὰς* sc. *μυριάδας τὰς ἔχων Ἀρτάβαζος ἔφευγε*, *τοὺς μετὰ Ἀρταβάζου φεύγοντας*) that the introduction of the patronymic would have been a stylistic absurdity. There may be a polemical purpose in this curious iteration: was there another Artabazos with whom 'the son of Pharnakes' was liable to be confounded? For example, the Artabazos who figures in Diodoros as successful against the Athenians in the Egyptian war (11. 74. 6, 77. 4), and again as admiral in the Kyprian war (12. 3. 2) and negotiating the 'Peace of Kallias' (12. 4. 5); cp. 7. 151 *supra*. Or is not that indeed the very same man? Otherwise who or what was his father, and his father's father? The name *Φαρνάκης* has been regarded as a variant for *Φαρνούχης* (or *vice versa*); cp. Rawlinson, iii.[3] p. 549. Was the father of Artabazos the high-placed hipparch who died by a fall from his horse at Sardes? cp. 7. 88. The names Pharnakes and Pharnabazos afterwards recur in the satrapy of Daskyleion; cp. 8. 126

πρόσω ἐγίνετο. ἀπικόμενον δέ μιν οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ παρὰ σφέας ἐπί τε ξείνια ἐκάλεον καὶ ἀνειρώτων περὶ τῆς στρατιῆς τῆς ἄλλης, οὐδὲν ἐπιστάμενοι τῶν ἐν Πλαταιῇσι γενομένων. ὁ δὲ Ἀρτάβαζος γνοὺς ὅτι, εἰ ἐθέλει σφι πᾶσαν τὴν ἀληθείην τῶν

---

2 ἐγένετο **β** || παρά σφεας B 3 ἐπεί R(V) || ξένια **α** || ἀνειρώτευν Marc., Stein[1] (Ask. V, Gaisford): ἀνηρώτευν CPz 4 πλαταίῃισι **α**: πλαταίῃσι R(S)V || γινομένων **α** Marc. 5 ἐθέλει ABCSV: ἐθέλοι || ἀληθηΐην z || τῶν ἀγώνων del. van H.

---

supra. Pharnabazos 'son of Pharnakes,' 413–388 B.C. (Thuc. 8. 6. 1), was succeeded by Ariobarzanes (Xenoph. *Hell.* 5. 1. 28, cp. 1. 4. 7), and he in turn by an Artabazos; Krumbholz, *op. c.* p. 73. Another Ariobarzanes 'son of Artabazos' appears with his father among the most loyal followers of the last Dareios (cp. Arrian, 3. 21. 4, 23. 7, etc.). The names Pharnakes, Pharnabazos, Artabazos, Ariobarzanes all belong, *ll.c.*, apparently to one house, or clan, and that, one highly placed and esteemed in the Persian Empire (cp. Judeich *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa, *sub v.*). There is a gap in the succession at Daskyleion between 470 B.C. or thereabouts and 430 B.C. Was it filled by 'Pharnabazos' the father of Pharnakes II.? The name Pharnabazos does not occur in Hdt.

φεύγων ἐκ Πλαταιέων. Hdt. has been suspected of special relations with the family of Artabazos, cp. 8. 126 *supra*, but he never represents his retreat as anything but a φυγή. In that respect, unless it be in the softer verb at the close of this very chapter, ἀπενόστησε, he may have done his supposed patron less than justice. The 'flight' of Artabazos from 'Plataia' may be little more historical than the 'flight' of Xerxes from Athens. The story, as told in this chapter, is full of intrinsic improbabilities. The rôle assigned to Artabazos helped to explain two awkward facts, awkward especially to medizing Greeks afterwards: (*a*) the defeat of Mardonios, and their own; (*b*) the escape of 40,000 men, who might have been stopped, and offered as an atonement to the patriotic league. The historical element in the quarrels of Mardonios and Artabazos is problematic, and in view of the licence of Greek historiography a critic may be pardoned if he suspect at times that Artabazos never was on the field of Plataia at all. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 5 (19). **ἐκ Πλαταιέων** could not mean at most more than ἐκ τῆς Πλαταιίδος: cp. c. 16 *supra.*

καὶ δή here = ἤδη: cp. Index.

2. **πρόσω**, 'far on his way' by the time the Thebans surrendered, or Pausanias had put an end to them at 'Korinth.'

οἱ Θεσσαλοί: the first absurdity, for 'the sons of Aleuas' had been in the camp of Mardonios, cp. c. 58 *supra*, and had probably supported the view of Artabazos and the Thebans against Mardonios; cp. c. 41 *supra.* In any case it is not likely that Artabazos, with some 40,000 Persians, regained Thessaly ahead of the Aleuads and the Thessalian cavalry; or that on his arrival no news of τῶν ἐν Πλαταιῇσι had reached Thessaly. It does not really help to interpret οἱ Θεσσαλοί here as representing a different party, an opposing faction or element, the bulk of the population, and so on, as compared with the Aleuads and aristocracy; there were doubtless in Thessaly, as in Phokis, as in Boiotia, as in the Peloponnese, as possibly in Athens itself (cp. Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 13), two parties, two rival interests on the Persian question, but it remains an absurdity to attribute to either the ignorance here predicated of οἱ Θεσσαλοί.

3. **ἐπὶ ξείνια ἐκάλεον**, 'invited to a banquet,' cp. c. 16 *supra.*

καί, 'at which they . .'

τῆς στρατιῆς τῆς ἄλλης: i.e. the army of Mardonios (not their own men); cp. ὁ μετ' αὐτοῦ στρατός, and αὐτὸς Μαρδόνιος καὶ ὁ στρατὸς αὐτοῦ just below.

5. **εἰ ἐθέλει**: cp. εἰ ἐθελήσει 1. 32.

πᾶσαν τὴν ἀληθείην τῶν ἀγώνων εἰπεῖν: that is unfortunately what no one has done, not even Hdt. himself. Artabazos least of all could afford to do so, if Hdt.'s record of him is true. The plural recognizes a number of ἀγῶνες at Plataia; or are they inquiring about the previous campaign too?

ἀγώνων εἰπεῖν, αὐτός τε κινδυνεύσει ἀπολέσθαι καὶ ὁ μετ' αὐτοῦ στρατός· ἐπιθήσεσθαι γάρ οἱ πάντα τινὰ οἴετο πυνθανόμενον τὰ γεγονότα· ταῦτα ἐκλογιζόμενος οὔτε πρὸς τοὺς Φωκέας ἐξηγόρευε οὐδὲν πρός τε τοὺς Θεσσαλοὺς ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἐγὼ μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες Θεσσαλοί, ὡς ὁρᾶτε, ἐπείγομαί τε κατὰ τάχος ἐλῶν ἐς Θρηίκην καὶ σπουδὴν ἔχω, πεμφθεὶς κατά τι πρῆγμα ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου μετὰ τῶνδε· αὐτὸς δὲ ὑμῖν Μαρδόνιος καὶ ὁ στρατὸς αὐτοῦ, οὗτος κατὰ πόδας ἐμεῦ

---

6 εἶπαι *z*, van H. 7 αὐτὸν Marc. || οἴετο **β***z* : ὤιετο **α** : ὠΐετο C : ὤιετο P : ὤετο Marc. : secl. Cobet, van H. 8 τοὺς om. S Marc. 9 ἐξαγόρευε C Marc., Gaisford || οὐδεὶς C 10 κατὰ τάχος Stein(1) 2, Holder : τὴν ταχίστην Stein1, van H. : κατὰ τὴν ταχίστην Marc. *z* : κατὰ ταχίστην A(RV ?) : κατὰ ταχίστηϊ B : καταταχίστην CP : κατατάχιστα S (Gaisf.) 11 ἐλθὼν Ask. : ἐλθεῖν *z* || θρήκην R(S)V 13 αὐτοῦ om. Marc. || ἐμεῦ om. **β** : μου *z* : μευ Krueger

---

8. **οὔτε πρὸς τοὺς Φωκέας ἐξηγόρευε οὐδέν**: i.e. while marching through Phokis, as he must have done to get to Thessaly. This statement is evidently an afterthought (but that hardly converts ἐξηγόρευε into a pluperfect!). It is also an absurdity. There were 1000 Phokians in the camp of Mardonios, c. 17 *supra*; they would not have allowed Artabazos to get such a start of them. Had they done so, the remainder of the nation at home, on Parnassos, who ἐνθεῦτεν ὁρμώμενοι ἔφερόν τε καὶ ἦγον τήν τε Μαρδονίου στρατιὴν καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐόντας Ἑλλήνων c. 31 *supra*, would hardly have allowed Artabazos free passage, much less entertained him, or invited his reports! However, to them he held his peace; to the Thessalians he told a lie. It is, however, also perhaps an absurdity to suppose, or imply, that there was any force at the disposal of the Phokians which could have barred the retreat of Artabazos.

10. **ὦ ἄνδρες Θεσσαλοί**: he talks as though he were addressing a public meeting. His speech incidentally furnishes three curious examples of the use of **κατά** (κατὰ τάχος—κατά τι πρῆγμα—κατὰ πόδας). His haste is expressed thrice over: ἐπείγομαι· κατὰ τάχος ἐλῶν· σπουδὴν ἔχω: he makes little of his 40,000 companions (μετὰ τῶνδε).

11. **ἐς Θρηίκην**: why to Thrace? Why not to Makedonia? Why does he advertise the Thessalians that his bourne is Thrace, instead of specifying his nearer objective, unless it be that Artabazos had really a special mission in Thrace, was, in fact, governor of the province? The vague reference to his mission, the suppression of his object (κατά τι πρῆγμα), is not the least of the absurdities in the story; Artabazos would have had the sense to lie with more circumstance, if lying had been necessary, or the Thessalians would have asked for details. But this story presents one of those monologues which are all alike suspicious, cp. c. 58 *supra*.

πεμφθείς seems to imply the subordination of Artabazos to Mardonios, cp. c. 42 *supra*, and is in so far unfavourable to the son of Pharnakes, who indeed, on his own showing, is 'a slight unmeritable man, meet to be sent on errands!'

12. **ὑμῖν**: a pretty 'ethical' dative; the announcement that Mardonios with his army is close at hand (or at heel) is a fresh absurdity: the said commander and army after spending the previous winter in Thessaly had gone south with a manifest object; the Thessalians would have known, or asked, how far that object had been accomplished. The more, however, the actual numbers of the force of Mardonios are reduced, the less absurd this item becomes. *Per contra*, this whole anecdote is hardly consistent with the view that the army numbered about 300,000—except, indeed, so far as Hdt. throughout operates with myriads and millions as though they were emancipate from the conditions of space and time; cp. 7. 60.

ἐλαύνων προσδόκιμος ἐστί. τοῦτον καὶ ξεινίζετε καὶ εὖ ποιεῦντες φαίνεσθε· οὐ γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐς χρόνον ταῦτα ποιεῦσι μεταμελήσει." ταῦτα δὲ εἴπας ἀπήλαυνε σπουδῇ τὴν στρατιὴν διὰ Θεσσαλίης τε καὶ Μακεδονίης ἰθὺ τῆς Θρηίκης, ὡς ἀληθέως ἐπειγόμενος, καὶ τὴν μεσόγαιαν τάμνων τῆς ὁδοῦ. καὶ ἀπικνέεται ἐς Βυζάντιον, καταλιπὼν τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ ἑωυτοῦ

---

14 *καὶ* om. Paris. 1635 *z* || *καὶ* om. C 15 *ποιοῦντες* Marc. 16 *ἀπέλαυνε* **β***z* 17 *θρήκης* R(S)V 18 *μεσόγεαν* R || *τέμνων* S || *καὶ* om. Marc.

---

14. **ξεινίζετε** (7. 27) (as ye are entertaining me).

15. **ἐς χρόνον** = *ὕστερον*: cp. 3. 72 *ἄμεινον ἐς χρόνον ἔσται.*

ταῦτα ποιεῦσι, conditional: *ἢν τοῦτον καὶ ξεινίζητε καὶ εὖ ποιεῦντες φαίνησθε. ταῦτα ποιεῦσι* and **εὖ ποιεῦντες** (just before) of course are not identical. **σπουδῇ**: cp. 1. 11 *supra.*

17. **Μακεδονίης** here appears *en route,* and signalizes another absurdity, for absurdity may lie in an assumption, and an assumption be made by omission. What then of Alexander and the Makedonians at this crisis? (Was he not, like the Aleuadai so far, in Artabazos' company?) Demosthenes, 23. 200, says that 'Perdikkas' king of Makedonia destroyed *τοὺς ἀναχωροῦντας ἐκ Πλαταιῶν τῶν βαρβάρων* and completed 'the king's' disaster *τέλειον τἀτύχημα (ποιήσας) τῷ βασιλεῖ,* and was given *πολιτεία* by the Athenians in consequence (ps.-Dem. 13. 24). Perhaps the only serious mistake Demosthenes here makes is in calling the Makedonian 'Perdikkas'; but the passage says nothing of Artabazos, and might be true even if Alexander saw Artabazos and his 40,000 safely through Makedonia, and no less true if Artabazos had never taken his 40,000 southwards across the Axios at all!

ἰθὺ τῆς Θρηίκης, 'straight for Thrace,' genitive of the direction off which the movement is estimated. The construction is frequent in Homer and Hdt., e.g. 4. 89 *ἰθὺ τοῦ Ἴστρου,* 6. 95 *ἰθὺ τοῦ τε Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ τῆς Θρηίκης.* But *ἰθὺς ἐπὶ Θεσσαλίης* 5. 64, *ἰθέως ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον* 8. 108 (where the adverb may perhaps be taken in a temporal signification).

ὡς ἀληθέως ἐπειγόμενος re-emphasizes the point humorously: 'that he was in a hurry was true enough.'

18. **τὴν μεσόγαιαν τάμνων τῆς ὁδοῦ**: i.e. marching not by the coast, but by a shorter or more direct route, further inland; cp. 7. 124. It is not clear for what portion of the route of Artabazos the remark holds good; doubtless from Therme to Akanthos, cp. *l.c.*; but further east likewise an inland course may have been followed, from Akanthos to Doriskos for example; cp. 7. 121. At Doriskos (cp. 7. 106) Artabazos would learn that the bridges on the Hellespont were threatened, or were in fact destroyed, cp. c. 114 *infra* (if he did not know it already), and that Sestos was being blockaded, if not actually in the hands of the Hellenes. To get to Byzantion he would therefore give the Hellespont and Thrakian Chersonese a wide berth, though he might have made for Perinthos in the first instance (cp. 7. 25).

19. **ἀπικνέεται ἐς Βυζάντιον.** Hdt. unfortunately does not date the arrival of Artabazos at Byzantion, but it must have been before the capture of Byzantion by Pausanias in 478–7 B.C. (Thuc. 1. 94. 2), and he had again evacuated it, or we should have heard more definitely of his having been among those, *βασιλέως προσήκοντές τινες καὶ ξυγγενεῖς οἳ ἑάλωσαν ἐν αὐτῷ* (Thuc. 1. 128. 5). Besides, he reappears very soon as satrap of Daskyleion (Thuc. 1. 129). This is, oddly enough, the first and only mention of Byzantion by Hdt. in these Books; it figures more largely in his 'second volume,' cp. 4. 87, 144, 5. 26, 103, 6. 5, 26, 33 (probably after he had seen the city, cp. *Hdt. IV.–VI.* i. p. xcv.); it is not mentioned in Bks. 1, 2, 3, an accident arising, perhaps, from the nature of their contents, or from the circumstances of their composition.

τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ ἑωυτοῦ: this force had originally consisted of 60,000 men, 8. 126; it is reported at 40,000

συχνοὺς ὑπὸ Θρηίκων κατακοπέντας κατ᾽ ὁδὸν καὶ λιμῷ συστάντας καὶ καμάτῳ· ἐκ Βυζαντίου δὲ διέβη πλοίοισι. οὗτος μὲν οὕτω ἀπενόστησε ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην.

90 Τῆς δὲ αὐτῆς ἡμέρης τῆς περ ἐν Πλαταιῇσι τὸ τρῶμα ἐγένετο, συνεκύρησε γενέσθαι καὶ ἐν Μυκάλῃ τῆς Ἰωνίης . . . . ἐπεὶ

20 *θρηκῶν* R(S)V || *τε κατακοπέντας* **B**z, Holder, van H. 21 *βυζαντείου* R 22 *οὗτος* S, Stein[2], Holder, van H. : *οὕτως* RV : *αὐτὸς* **90.** 1 *πλαταίῃισι* **a** : *πλαταίῃσι* R(S)V 2 *συνεκήρυσε* z || <*τὸ*> *ἐν* Krueger, van H. || *μυκάλλῃ* S || lacunam indic. Stein[3] || *ἐπειδὴ γὰρ* **B**Pz, Holder

before the battle of Plataia (*δύναμιν οὐκ ὀλίγην* c. 66 *supra*) without any attempt to explain the discrepancy. It is presumably still further reduced in this passage, unless, indeed, the 20,000 very inadequately accounted for by the operations at Olynthos and Poteidaia (8 *l.c.*) cover the total losses of Artabazos during his command in Europe.

20. **ὑπὸ Θρηίκων κατακοπέντας κατ᾽ ὁδόν.** Hdt. does not charge or honour the Makedonians or their king with inflicting any losses on Artabazos: that was reserved for Attic tradition; cp. *l.c. supra*. If Artabazos lost no men in Phokis, Thessaly or Makedonia, it argues that he had few if any men with him while passing through those regions, or else that the populations of those regions were friendly. Losses in Thrace, from actual hostilities of a guerrilla kind, from failure of supplies, and from exhaustion, his forces may have experienced; but the moderation of this record, in contrast with the story of the flight of Xerxes in the previous year (8. 115–117), is observable, and tends to discredit the accounts of the annihilation of *la Grande Armée*. Probably the experiences of the various forces, in various years, during the retreats through Thrace, have not been very carefully distinguished by Greek tradition.

λιμῷ συστάντας καὶ καμάτῳ: *fame conflictatos* (Baehr; cp. 7. 170 (more naturally of a garrison besieged)), *et laboribus*. *κάματος* (*κάμνω*), an Homeric and poetical word for labour, and its resultant fatigue.

21. **διέβη πλοίοισι**: he would only want one boat for his own crossing; the plural refers to his army; cp. *πλοίῳ διαβαίνειν* 1. 186. The Persians with Xerxes in the previous year, according to 8. 117 *τῇσι νηυσὶ διέβησαν ἐς Ἄβυδον*, that of course was on the Hellespont in the narrower sense (cp. c. 66 *supra*), which was now closed to Artabazos by the Greeks at Sestos. The warships were no longer in those waters; but it is perhaps curious that Artabazos, with 40,000 men, more or less, makes no attempt to raise the siege of Sestos; c. 118 *infra*. Hdt. does not specify the point opposite Byzantion at which Artabazos and his men landed: did he not as yet know the geography of the Bosporos (4. 85), or is the omission simply taken over inadvertently from his source? Byzantion must have been a notorious place and position at any and every date possible for Hdt.'s composition. Captured by Pausanias in 478–7 B.C. from the Persians (Thuc. 1. 94. 2), and from Pausanias by the Athenians (*ib.* 1. 131. 1) a year or two later (cp. Busolt, III. i. 96), when the city became a contributing member of the Athenian Alliance, with the high assessment of fifteen talents (normal quota 1500 Dr. or upwards; cp. Hill's *Sources* c. ii., *C.I.A.* i. *passim*), Hdt. may have visited the city after the thirty years' truce (cp. *Hdt. IV.–VI.* i. pp. xciii., xcv.), and probably long after the composition of this passage: the fruits of that visit are to be seen at large in *The Scythian Logoi* (4. 1–144).

90. 1. **τῆς δὲ αὐτῆς ἡμέρης.** On this synchronism cp. cc. 100, 101 *infra*.

τὸ τρῶμα: just as in 5. 121, 6. 132. The relative **τῆς** may be in the same construction as *ἡμέρης*: the genitive of time is a partitive genitive; 'in the course of the same day' (Madvig, § 66). Cp. c. 94. 12 *infra*, and Index.

2. **συνεκύρησε γενέσθαι**: the verb is used with an expressed subject, 8. 87. The construction is obviously incomplete; cp. App. Crit.

γὰρ δὴ ἐν τῇ Δήλῳ κατέατο οἱ Ἕλληνες οἱ ἐν τῇσι νηυσὶ ἅμα Λευτυχίδῃ τῷ Λακεδαιμονίῳ ἀπικόμενοι, ἦλθόν σφι ἄγγελοι ἀπὸ Σάμου Λάμπων τε Θρασυκλέος καὶ Ἀθηναγόρης Ἀρχεστρατίδεω καὶ Ἡγησίστρατος Ἀρισταγόρεω, πεμφθέντες ὑπὸ Σαμίων λάθρῃ τῶν τε Περσέων καὶ τοῦ τυράννου Θεομήστορος τοῦ Ἀνδροδάμαντος, τὸν κατέστησαν Σάμου τύραννον οἱ Πέρσαι. ἐπελθόντων δὲ σφέων ἐπὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἔλεγε

3 καθέατο **B**: ἐκατέατο z   5 τε ὁ **B** || θρασυκλέους **a** Marc.: θρασικλέους C: Θρασυκλῆος z || ἀρχιστρατίδεω **B**   7 θεομήτορος A, Ask.: θεομνήτορος **B** (ν supersc. V)   8 τύραννον σάμου **B** || οἱ Πέρσαι om. Ask.

3. **ἐν τῇ Δήλῳ κτλ.** The record of the naval operations, treated throughout as absolutely independent of the land-campaign in central Greece, is resumed from 8. 132. **κατέατο** here can hardly refer to winter-quarters (*pace* Stein), for the advance to Delos is expressly dated after the advent of spring, 8. 131, 132. No doubt the expression *ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ κατημένοι* 8. 130 is used of a portion of the Persian fleet wintering in Samos; but the winter there does not turn on the word *κάτημαι* but on the context. The word suggests (relative) inactivity, as in a siege, or blockade; cp. Thuc. 4. 124. 4 *ὁ Περδίκκας ἐβούλετο προιέναι ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀρραβαίου κώμας καὶ μὴ καθῆσθαι* (cp. *ἀντεκαθέζοντο ib.* 2); *id.* 2. 20. 3 *πεῖραν ἐποιεῖτο περὶ τὰς Ἀχαρνὰς καθήμενος εἰ ἐπεξίασιν* (of Archidamos in summer!); 2. 101. 2 *καθημένου δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τοὺς χώρους τούτους* (of Sitalkes, in winter, certainly, but not in winter-quarters!).

4. **Λευτυχίδῃ τῷ Λακεδαιμονίῳ**: the addition appears both superfluous and bald after the full pedigree, 8. 131. Leotychidas' father's name was probably not familiar to foreigners; Hdt. may have taken over the title from his source.

ἄγγελοι ἀπὸ Σάμου: this embassy contrasts with the Chian embassy described 8. 132. It consists of only three men (instead of six), but they have an indubitable commission (*πεμφθέντες ὑπὸ Σαμίων*), and they not merely invoke the navarch to liberate Ionia but bring assurances of an Ionian revolt from the Persians. In both cases there is the same connexion between the *tyrannis* and the Persian supremacy; Strattis of Chios, Theomestor of Samos, are alike immersed in medism.

5. **Λάμπων . . Θρασυκλέος.** Of this Samian Lampon nothing more is recorded. The name is a common one; Hdt. mentions an Athenian c. 21 *supra*, an Aiginetan c. 78 *supra*—three in this Book! Cp. notes *ad ll.c.* Thrasykles of Samos only figures here. The best known bearer of the name is an Athenian; cp. Thuc. 5. 19. 2, 24. 1, 8. 15. 1, 17. 3, 19. 2.

Ἀθηναγόρης Ἀρχεστρατίδεω. The Samian Athenagoras is merely a name. Thucydides mentions two others, namesakes—a prominent Syracusan, 6. 35; a Rhodian, 8. 6. 'Archestratides' is less common a name than Archestratos (which it implies), but appears at Athens (e.g. the Archon 577–6 B.C.).

6. **Ἡγησίστρατος Ἀρισταγόρεω.** Hegesistratos proves the ring-leader and bird of good omen. He is one of three men of the name mentioned by Hdt.; cp. cc. 37–41 *supra* (the Telliad) and 5. 94 (a son of Peisistratos). This name comes very near the preceding (Archestratides), and the patronym 'Aristagoras' is not very different in sense from Athenagoras (perhaps the two pairs were related?) but of more frequent occurrence. Hdt. alone mentions four men of the name: (1) the tyrant of Kyme 4. 138, 5. 37; (2) the tyrant of Kyzikos 4. 138; (3) the tyrant of Miletos 5. 30, etc. etc.; (4) the Samian here, of whom nothing more is known.

7. **Θεομήστορος τοῦ Ἀνδροδάμαντος**: cp. 8. 85 *supra*; he had not enjoyed the tyranny very long! The absence of any express reference back to the previous passage is observable; the sources are probably different here and there. (The article is hardly referential.)

9. **ἐπελθόντων . . ἐπὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς.** *ἐπέρχεσθαι*, 'to come forward for

Ἡγησίστρατος πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖα, ὡς ἢν μοῦνον ἴδωνται αὐτοὺς οἱ Ἴωνες ἀποστήσονται ἀπὸ Περσέων, καὶ ὡς οἱ βάρβαροι οὐκ ὑπομενέουσι· ἢν δὲ καὶ ἄρα ὑπομείνωσι, οὐκ ἑτέρην ἄγρην τοιαύτην εὑρεῖν ἂν αὐτούς· θεούς τε κοινοὺς ἀνακαλέων προέτραπε αὐτοὺς ῥύσασθαι ἄνδρας Ἕλληνας ἐκ δουλοσύνης καὶ ἀπαμῦναι τὸν βάρβαρον. εὐπετές τε αὐτοῖσι ἔφη ταῦτα γίνεσθαι· τάς τε γὰρ νέας αὐτῶν κακῶς πλέειν

12 ὑπονέουσιν C || ἆρα AB || οὐκ ὑπομενέουσι C 13 ἂν om. **B** 14 προέτρεπε(ν) libri 16 νῆας αὐτέων z || πλώειν van H.

the purpose of speaking,' 'to address'; cp. c. 7 *supra.* The scene here is laid in the Synedrion of Strategoi, over which Leotychidas is presiding at Delos, as Eurybiades at Salamis in the previous year; cp. 8. 49 *supra.*

10. **παντοῖα** does not seem to be very complimentary to the speech of Hegesistratos; cp. 7. 10 *supra.* The report imitates the 'variousness,' for it is made up of (1) a double conditional assertion, (*a*) positive and (*b*) negative, each limb constructed with *ὡς* and indicative (fut.) but nevertheless in the oblique (*αὐτοὺς* not *ὑμέας*); (2) a conditional, in strict *oratio obliqua,* i.e. accus. and infinitive; (3) a narrative report (*ἀνακαλέων προέτραπε κτλ.*) which again indirectly reproduces the speaker; (4) a resumption of the *oratio obliqua* with *ἔφη* (the *recta* might well have been introduced here!) in (*a*) a simple assertion of fact, or opinion, (*b*) a rather complex conditional sentence, with the idiomatic subject of the apodosis in the nominative (*αὐτοί τε κτλ.*).

11. **οἱ Ἴωνες ἀποστήσονται**: if they will merely show themselves at Samos 'the Ionians will revolt'—the speaker could hardly, perhaps, answer for more than his own island. Was this promise kept? Cp. c. 99 *infra.*

οἱ βάρβαροι οὐκ ὑπομενέουσι: the Persian fleet is at Samos 8. 130 *supra.* This prediction proved correct, c. 96 *infra.* The alternative proposed is the seizure of the king's fleet in the Samian harbour; that would be a 'haul,' the like of which they could never make again.

12. **ἄρα**: a particle suggesting surprise, improbability, etc.; cp. 8. 135 *supra,* and Index.

13. **ἄγρην** is generally the chase, the hunting, e.g. 1. 73, absolutely, 3. 129 *θηρῶν*, 2. 70 *ἄγραι πολλαὶ καὶ παντοῖαι*, 'many various ways of catching' (*τῶν κροκοδείλων*). Here, not the hunting but the 'quarry,' not the chase but the 'catch,' a usage originally perhaps poetic (e.g. Aischyl. *Eumen.* 148, Sophokl. *Ai.* 64, Eurip. *Fr.* 521), literally of a draught of fishes, *Ev. Luc.* 5. 9.

θεούς τε κοινοὺς ἀνακαλέων. On the *κοινοὶ θ.* cp. 8. 144 *supra.* *ἀνακαλεῖν* in Aischyl. *Pers.* 621 is to call up the dead; here rather, to call up to, 'to invoke,' the immortals; cp. Soph. *O.K.* *ἀνακαλοῦμαι ξυμμάχους ἐλθεῖν θεούς.* Cp. 5. 93 *τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπικαλέσας θεούς.* Or, perhaps, 'recalling' (to the minds of the hearers), appealing to . . (Cp. the description of Chryses imploring Apollo, Plat. *Rep.* 394 A *τάς τε ἐπωνυμίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνακαλῶν.*)

14. **προέτραπε αὐτούς**: sc. *τοὺς Ἕλληνας.* The verb is used more curiously in 1. 31. In Aristot. *Eth. N.* 3. 5. 7 = 1113 B it is used in contrast to *κωλύειν.* With this passage cp. Thuc. 8. 63. 3 *αὐτῶν τῶν Σαμίων προυτρέψαντο τοὺς δυνατωτάτους ὥστε πειρᾶσθαι μετὰ σφῶν ὀλιγαρχηθῆναι*, 5. 16. 3 *χρόνῳ δὲ προτρέψαι τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους φεύγοντα αὐτὸν . . καταγαγεῖν.* Thuc., as it happens, like Hdt., uses the word twice only, once in the act., once in the mid. voice.

ῥύσασθαι ἄνδρας Ἕλ. ἐκ δουλοσύνης: the speech of Hegesistratos has a curious resemblance to the speech of Aristagoras at Sparta in 498 B.C., 5. 49, given in *oratio recta.* Did Hegesistratos consciously reproduce Aristagoras? Or does the similarity of the two situations explain the coincidence? Or did Hdt. mould the one passage on the other, that one, perhaps, on this?

15. **εὐπετές.** Is this word used adverbially, or must *εἶναι* be supplied? The proper adverb is found 8. 68. 18 *supra, et al.*, the substantive construction 5. 97.

16. **αὐτῶν**: sc. *τῶν βαρβάρων.*

κακῶς πλέειν, 'were ill-found for

καὶ οὐκ ἀξιομάχους κείνοισι εἶναι. αὐτοί τε, εἴ τι ὑποπτεύουσι μὴ δόλῳ αὐτοὺς προάγοιεν, ἕτοιμοι εἶναι ἐν τῇσι νηυσὶ τῇσι ἐκείνων ἀγόμενοι ὅμηροι εἶναι.

ὡς δὲ πολλὸς ἦν 91
λισσόμενος [ὁ ξεῖνος] ὁ Σάμιος, εἴρετο Λευτυχίδης, εἴτε κληδόνος εἵνεκεν θέλων πυθέσθαι εἴτε καὶ κατὰ συντυχίην θεοῦ ποιεῦντος, "ὦ ξεῖνε Σάμιε, τί τοι τὸ οὔνομα;" ὁ δὲ εἶπε "Ἡγησίστρατος." ὁ δὲ ὑπαρπάσας τὸν ἐπίλοιπον λόγον, εἴ τινα ὅρμητο λέγειν ὁ Ἡγησίστρατος, εἶπε "δέκομαι τὸν οἰωνὸν τὸν Ἡγησιστράτου, ὦ ξεῖνε Σάμιε. σὺ δὲ ἡμῖν ποίεε ὅκως αὐτός τε δοὺς πίστιν ἀποπλεύσεαι καὶ οἱ σὺν σοὶ ἐόντες οἵδε, ἦ μὲν Σαμίους ἡμῖν προθύμους ἔσεσθαι συμ-

18 *προαγάγοιεν* **ß** || *ἑτοῖμοι* CP Marc. *z* || *ἐν τῇσι νηυσὶ* ante *ἑτοῖμοι* *z* 19 *κείνων* **α** 91. 2 *ὁ ξεῖνος ὁ Σάμιος* del. Gomperz, Holder : *ὁ ξεῖνος* tantum Stein[3] : *ὁ* ante *Σάμιος* om. CP || *ἤρετο* C || *ὁ λευ(λεω* R*)τυχίδης* **ß** 3 *κληδόνος* *z* : *κλεηδόνος* Merzdorf || *εἵνεκα* RS || *καὶ* om. **ß** 4 *θεοῦ ποιεῦντος* del. Gomperz, Holder || *τὸ* om. **ß**, Holder || *ὄνομα* van H. 5 *ὑφαρπάσας* **α** 6 *ὅρμητο* SV, Gaisford, Stein[2], Holder, van H. : *ὥρμητο* 7 *τὸν ἡγησίστρατον* **ß** : del. Valckenaer, Holder, van H. : non male 8 *ἀποπλώσεαι* van H. 9 *μὴν* **ß***z* || *προθύμως* *z*

sea'; cp. 8. 42 *supra*, referring as much to the crews as to the hulls.

17. **κείνοισι**: sc. *τοῖς Ἕλλησι*.

αὐτοί τε: in *oratio recta* the sentence would run: *αὐτοί τε, εἴ τι ὑποπτεύετε μὴ δόλῳ ὑμέας προάγωμεν, ἕτοιμοι ἐσμὲν ἐν τῇσι νηυσὶ τῇσι ὑμετέρῃσι ἀγόμενοι ὅμηροι εἶναι.*

18. **δόλῳ**: cp. 8. 140 *supra*.

91. 1. **πολλός**: cp. 7. 158 *supra*.

3. **κληδόνος εἵνεκεν**: i.e. for the sake of getting an omen from it; cp. c. 101 *infra*, and 5. 72. *κληδών* is no ordinary sound, or rumour, but a significant, a portentous voice. The king was surely acquainted with the name of the orator addressing the Council, before the speaking began.

κατὰ συντυχίην θεοῦ ποιεῦντος: *τύχη, συντυχίη*, are beyond direct human control or agency, but not independent of the divine agency, cp. *θείῃ τύχῃ* 4. 8, not substantially different from *θ. πόμπῃ* 4. 152; cp. also 5. 92, where the *τύχη* is clearly providential.

5. **ὁ δὲ ὑπαρπάσας κτλ.**: cp. 5. 50 *ὁ δὲ ὑπαρπάσας τὸν ἐπίλοιπον λόγον τὸν ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ὥρμητο* (*sic*) *λέγειν*: one or other passage is a copy—probably that of this? cp. c. 90 *supra*.

6. **δέκομαι τὸν οἰωνόν.** If *δέκεσθαι* in itself meant to accept as ominous, then *τὸν οἰωνόν* here would be *de trop*; cp. 8. 115 *supra*. *οἰωνός* is also once used in Thucydides, 6. 27. 3 *τοῦ τε γὰρ ἔκπλου οἰωνὸς ἐδόκει εἶναι κτλ.* Cp. *Il.* 12. 243 *εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης.* Blakesley well cites the parallel anecdote of L. Paullus, *quum ei, bellum ut cum rege Perse gereret, obtigisset.* He came home that evening to find his little daughter in the depths. "*Quid est,*" *inquit*, "*mea Tertia? quid tristis es?*" "*Mi pater* (*inquit*), *Persa periit.*" *Tum ille arctius puellam complexus* "*Accipio,*" *inquit*, "*mea filia, omen*": *erat autem mortuus catellus eo nomine.* Cicero *de Divin.* 1. 46.

7. **σὺ δὲ ἡμῖν κτλ.**, 'but do thou, prithee, contrive, before you sail away, to pledge yourselves . .' The apparent is not the real predicate; the position of *αὐτός τε . . πίστιν* secures the phrase predicative force; the words **καὶ οἱ σὺν σοὶ ἐόντες οἵδε** is hardly in construction.

9. **ἦ μὲν Σαμίους . . συμμάχους**: the formula *ἦ μέν* (*ἦ μήν, ἦ μάν*, all three Homeric), of oath-taking, occurs generally in *oratio recta*, but also, as here, in *obliqua*, after verbs of swearing, etc. (*πίστιν δούς*), cp. 4. 154, 5. 93. The Samians alone are here nominated: what of the 'Ionians' c. 90 *supra*?

92 *μάχους."* *ταῦτά τε ἅμα ἠγόρευε καὶ τὸ ἔργον προσῆγε·*
αὐτίκα γὰρ οἱ Σάμιοι πίστιν τε καὶ ὅρκια ἐποιεῦντο συμ-
μαχίης πέρι πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες οἳ
μὲν ἀπέπλεον· [μετὰ σφέων γὰρ ἐκέλευε πλέειν τὸν Ἡγησί-
στρατον, οἰωνὸν τὸ οὔνομα ποιεύμενος·] οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες
ἐπισχόντες ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην τῇ ὑστεραίῃ ἐκαλλιερέοντο,
μαντευομένου σφι Δηιφόνου τοῦ Εὐηνίου ἀνδρὸς Ἀπολλωνιήτεω,
93 *Ἀπολλωνίης δὲ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἰονίῳ κόλπῳ. τούτου τὸν πατέρα*

---

92. 1 *προῆγεν* **B** 3 *τοὺς* om. C Marc. || *οἳ μὲν*: an '*οἱ μὲν δύο?*' Bekker, van H.: (*οἱ μὲν* Stein[1 3]: *οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι* coni. Stein[2]) 4 *ἀπέπλωον* van H. || *μετὰ . . ποιεύμενος* secl. Stein[3] || *μετά σφεων* PR*z* || *ποιέειν* *z*: *πλώειν* van H. || *τὸν Ἡγησίστρατον* om. **B** 7 *μαντευομένους* R(S)V || *δηϊοφόνου* C 8 *ἰωνικῷ* **B** **93.** 1 incipit verbis *οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες* supra, Stein[2], Holder, van H. || *τούτου*: *τοῦ* **B**, Holder

---

92. 1. ταῦτά τε ἅμα κτλ.: for the parataxis cp. 8. 5, c. 98 *supra*, and 3. 135 *ταῦτα εἶπε καὶ ἅμα ἔπος τε καὶ ἔργον ἐποίεε*—a still more forcible parataxis. **προσῆγε,** sc. *τούτοις*, or *τῷ ἔπει*.

2. **αὐτίκα γὰρ οἱ Σάμιοι κτλ.** If authentic, and true, this statement is of high historical importance as (*a*) dating the admission of the Samians, and of the Samians alone, into the Hellenic Symmachy before the battle of Mykale; (*b*) representing the matriculation into the Symmachy as effected by the king-navarch, without reference to any further authority (except perhaps the *Synedrion* of admirals). The exact scope of the Symmachy is not here defined, but it could hardly be one restricted in its object to the liberation of Samos from the Persians and the tyrant; it appears to be the general alliance, *πρὸς τὸν Πέρσην* (7. 145) or *ἐπὶ τῷ Μήδῳ* Thuc. 1. 102. 4. Or did they only bind themselves, *συμμαχίης πέρι*, to become full members of the Symmachy as soon as they were free? Cp. c. 106 *infra*.

3. **οἳ μὲν . . ποιεύμενος.** The end of this chapter at least looks very unsatisfactory. *οἳ μέν* as it stands covers all the Samians, and if Hegesistratos is to be detained, and the last sentence is to be retained, *οἳ μέν* must be amended, or supplemented, but the detention of Hegesistratos is inconsistent with the permission or command above *ποίεε ὅκως ἀποπλεύσεαι*. If *τὸν οἰωνόν* is retained in c. 91, *οἰωνὸν τὸ οὔνομα ποιεύμενος* here is intolerable. Cp. App. Crit.

6. **ἐπισχόντες.** Why this pause? (8. 23, 66, 113, c. 49 *supra*, *et al.*). Mardonios had doubtless evacuated Attica by this time; the fleet was presumably in communication with the army in Attica, or in Boiotia. They obtained favourable omens for proceeding no doubt at the right strategic point.

ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην: the acc. of duration of time; Madvig, § 30. **τῇ ὑστεραίῃ**, the dat. of point of time, *ib.* § 45. Cp. c. 90 *ad init.* and Index.

ἐκαλλιερέοντο: a strong imperfect; for the word cp. 7. 134 *supra*. **μαντευομένου**, as in c. 36 *supra*.

7. **Δηιφόνου τοῦ Εὐηνίου.** The name 'Deiphonos' apparently occurs only in this passage; like other and commoner compounds of *δήιος* (*δάιος*, *δάις*) it has a distinctly archaic ring (well suited to a seer). *Εὐήνιος*—also unique as a personal name—is apparently the adj. of *Εὔηνος*, a river, or river-god, of Aitolia: Hesiod, *Theog.* 345; Thucyd. 2. 83. 3, etc. Its other (and earlier?) name was *Λυκόρμας*, cp. ps.-Plutarch *Mor.* 1011 (ed. Didot, v. 86). It is the central river of 'old' Aitolia, and Kalydon was on its bank; Strabo 451 describes its course; its modern name is *Phidari* (Baedeker, *Greece*, p. 29), and it debouches east of Mesolonghi.

8. **Ἀπολλωνίης δὲ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἰονίῳ κόλπῳ.** Steph. Byz. enumerates 25 cities of this name, some of them duplicates (Rawlinson). Hülsen *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa ii. 112 ff. enumerates 32 cities, islands, castles or places, which bore the name at one time or other. This observation concerns rather the popularity of Apollon than the matter in hand. The two

κατέλαβε Εὐήνιον πρῆγμα τοιόνδε. ἔστι ἐν τῇ Ἀπολλωνίῃ ταύτῃ ἱρὰ ἡλίου πρόβατα, τὰ τὰς μὲν ἡμέρας βόσκεται παρὰ

2 Εὐήνιον: ‘nonne melius abest?’ Kallenberg: secl. Holder: Εὐήνιον κατέλαβε transp. Stein[2] 3 τὰ: ἃ **B**

chief foundations were undoubtedly Apollonia on the Euxine (4. 90, 93 *supra*), and the one here in question. It was south of Epidamnos (cp. Thuc. 1. 26. 2), in proximity to the river Aous (see below). Strabo 316 *ἐφ' ᾧ Ἀπολλωνία πόλις εὐνομωτάτη κτίσμα Κορινθίων καὶ Κορκυραίων* (*Κορκυραίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων κτίσις* Skymnos, 440), *τοῦ ποταμοῦ μὲν ἀπέχουσα σταδίους δέκα τῆς θαλάττης δὲ ἑξήκοντα.* Thuc. *l.c.* makes it simply a Korinthian foundation (cp. Plutarch *Mor.* 552 F, who puts the foundation in the reign of Periander, i.e. before 585 B.C. The Olympian dedication (Pausan. 5. 22. 3) made Phoibos himself the founder. The coinage (silver, of five periods, but not going back before the fourth century B.C., cp. B. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 265) well illustrates the importance of Apollonia, especially in the Roman period, when the city was one of the W. *termini* of the Egnatian way, Dyrrachium (Epidamnos) being the other, Strabo 322. It played a considerable part in the civil war (cp. Caesar, *B. C.* 3. 1, Cicero, *Phil.* 11. 26); at Apollonia in 44 B.C. Octavius received the news of his uncle's death, and started to recover his inheritance and to refound the Empire.

ἐν τῷ Ἰονίῳ κόλπῳ: the usual designation of this Apollonia, e.g. Pausanias 5. 22. 3 *Ἀπολλωνιᾶται οἱ ἐν τῷ Ἰονίῳ*: cp. Aelian, *V. H.* 13. 16. Strabo 424 has *ἡ πρὸς Ἐπιδάμνῳ*, Steph. B. *ἡ κατ' Ἐπίδαμνον.* Cp. Thuc. 1. 24. 1 *Ἐπίδαμνός ἐστι πόλις ἐν δεξιᾷ ἐσπλέοντι ἐς τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον· προσοικοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν Ταυλάντιοι βάρβαροι, Ἰλλυρικὸν ἔθνος.* On the Ionian gulf cp. 7. 20 *supra* (*ὁ Ἰ. πόντος*). Strabo 316 *ad f.* places *ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου καὶ τοῦ Ἀδρίου* at the Keraunian mountains south of Apollonia and of Panormos, the port of Orikon; the ‘mouth’ is common to the ‘Ionian’ and ‘Adrian,’ the difference being that, properly speaking, the inner part of the sea is the ‘Adrian,’ and the outer, or lower, the ‘Ionian’ (cp. 4. 33, 5. 9, 1. 163).

93. 2. **κατέλαβε**: cp. cc. 60 *supra*, 104 *infra*, *τὰ καταλαβόντα* c. 49 *supra*.

3. **ἱρὰ ἡλίου πρόβατα**. ‘Phoibos’ himself was their founder (cp. Pausan. 5. 22. 3), the city bore the Apolline name, the fusion of *Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων* with *Ἥλιος* is therefore a *fait accompli* in Apollonia; and this perhaps is the oldest evidence of the amalgamation, in cult and myth. The *πρόβατα* here are apparently sheep, or goats (cp. *τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν προβάτων* 8. 137 *supra*), as they are raided by wolves. The animals associated with Helios are chariot-horses (*ὑπὸ δ' ἄρσενες ἵπποι*, *Hom. Hymn.* 31. 14), and, still earlier, oxen and sheep (*Od.* 12. 127 ff. *Ἠελίοιο βόες καὶ ἴφια μῆλα, ἑπτὰ βοῶν ἀγέλαι, τόσα δ' οἰῶν πώεα καλά*, 50 in each herd, or flock, 350 in all, tended by the nymphs, Phaethusa and Lampetie, day and night?). Apollon is almost certainly in origin a truly pastoral deity (and, especially as *Λύκιος, Λύκειος, Λυκόεργος*, the guardian of the sheep; as also *Κάρνειος, Νόμιος, Ἀρισταῖος*, etc.).

βόσκεται: middle, *pascuntur* (the active 6. 39, also 1. 44, in quasi-metaphorical sense). Cp. *Hom. Hymn. ad Apoll.* 412 f. *Ταίναρον ἔνθα τε μῆλα βαθύτριχα βόσκεται αἰεὶ Ἠελίοιο ἄνακτος.*

παρὰ [<Χῶνα>] ποταμόν. “There can be no doubt that the river intended is the Aous, or *Viosa*, which flows from the central part of Pindus, called Lacmon by the ancients (Hecat. Fr. 72, Soph. *ap.* Strab. vi. 391), and empties itself into the Adriatic a little south of the site of Apollonia” (Rawlinson). *Χῶνα* is restored by Stein from the *Canons* of Theognostos 794 (cp. Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.* ii. (135) p. 131 *Χών, Χωνός, ὄνομα ποταμοῦ ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἡ Ἤπειρος Χωνία παρὰ Ἡροδότῳ*). But it is *Χωνία*, not *Χών*, which this passage records for Hdt. The Epeirote ‘Chonia’ no doubt represents ‘Chaonia,’ which got its name from the *Χάονες* (cp. Thuc. 2. 68. 9, 80. 1, 5, 81. 3–6), and not from a river *Χών*, for whose real existence the *Canons* of Theognostos are not evidence. If such a river anywhere existed, it would perhaps be in South Italy, where the ‘Chaones’ reappear as ‘Chones,’ cp. note to 7. 170. 13 *supra*. The grammarian is wrong in citing Hdt. as authority for ‘Chonia’; and he has apparently invented ‘Chon’ to account for Chonia.

[<Χῶνα>] *ποταμόν, ὃς ἐκ Λάκμονος ὄρεος ῥέει διὰ τῆς* Ἀπολλωνίης [*χώρης*] *ἐς θάλασσαν παρ' Ὤρικον λιμένα, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἀραιρημένοι ἄνδρες οἱ πλούτῳ τε καὶ γένεϊ δοκιμώτατοι τῶν ἀστῶν, οὗτοι φυλάσσουσι ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστος· περὶ πολλοῦ γὰρ δὴ ποιεῦνται* Ἀπολλωνιῆται *τὰ πρόβατα ταῦτα ἐκ θεοπροπίου τινός· ἐν δὲ ἄντρῳ αὐλίζονται ἀπὸ τῆς πόλιος ἑκάς. ἔνθα δὴ τότε ὁ* Εὐήνιος *οὗτος ἀραιρημένος ἐφύλασσε. καί κοτε αὐτοῦ κατακοιμήσαντος φυλακὴν παρελθόντες λύκοι ἐς τὸ ἄντρον διέφθειραν τῶν προβάτων ὡς ἑξήκοντα. ὁ δὲ ὡς ἐπήισε, εἶχε σιγῇ καὶ ἔφραζε οὐδενί, ἐν νόῳ ἔχων*

---

4 Χῶνα e Theognosti canon. 794 inser. Stein, Holder, van H.: cancellos posui || *λακμόνος* B: *Λάκμωνος z*, van H. || *οὔρεος* CPMarc. *z*, van H. 5 Ἀπολλωνιήτιδος Valla (*per apolloniatem agrum*) || *χώρης* om. Marc.: secl. Stein[2] || *ὥρικον* Marc.: *ὥρηκον* R 6 *ἀναιρημένοι* C 7 *ἕκαστον* Apr.: *ἕκαστοι* C 8 *γὰρ*: *τε* **B** || *δὴ* om. C Marc. 9 *ἀπὸ* del. Cobet, van H. 10 *ἀφαιρημένος* R(S)V 11 *κατακοιμίσαντος* primo scr. sed statim correct. S(Gaisford)V, Reiske, Holder, van H. || *τὴν φυλακὴν* **B**P*z*, Holder, van H. 13 *ἐπῆισε* ABC: *ἐπῆσαν* Marc.: *ἐποίησεν* S || *ἔφραξε(ν)* **B** || *ἐνίῳ* S

---

4. **Λάκμονος ὄρεος**: Steph. B. *sub v.* *Λάκμων, ἄκρα τοῦ Πίνδου ὄρους, ἐξ ἧς ὁ Ἴναχος καὶ Αἴας ῥεῖ ποταμός· ὡς Ἑκαταῖος ἐν πρώτῳ.* Strabo 271, 316 (quoting Hekataios) gives the form *Λάκμος*: *τὸν δ' Ἄωον Αἴαντα καλεῖ Ἑκαταῖος καί φησιν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τόπου τοῦ περὶ Λάκμον, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μυχοῦ, τόν τε Ἴναχον ῥεῖν εἰς Ἄργος πρὸς νότον καὶ τὸν Αἴαντα πρὸς ἑσπέραν καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδρίαν.*

διὰ τῆς Ἀπολλωνίης: the name of the city for the country; cp. *ἐς Ἀθήνας=ἐς Ἀττικήν* c. 17 *supra*, *ἐς Θήβας*, *ibid.* etc.

5. **παρ' Ὤρικον λιμένα.** Steph. Byz. *sub v.* *Ἑκαταῖος λιμένα καλεῖ τῆς Ἠπείρου τὴν* (*sic*) *Ὠρικόν, ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ· μετὰ δὲ Βουθρωτὸς πόλις, μετὰ δὲ Ὠρικὸς λιμήν.* Orikos, or Oricum (so with the Latins, e.g. Caesar *B. C.* 3 *passim*), now is *Ericho*; no stream rising on Lakmon flows out anywhere near it. The geography of Hdt. is at fault, and probably at second hand; this passage, though it deals with the West, is probably not a result of his own western voyage, but belongs to the first draft of the Book.

6. **ἀραιρημένοι ἄνδρες**: cp. 7. 118 *supra.*

οἱ πλούτῳ τε καὶ γένεϊ δοκιμώτατοι: cp. Aristot. *Pol.* 6 (4). 4. 5=1290 B *ἐν Ἀπολλωνίᾳ τῇ ἐν τῷ Ἰονίῳ . . ἐν ταῖς τιμαῖς ἦσαν οἱ διαφέροντες κατ' εὐγένειαν καὶ πρῶτοι κατασχόντες* <*τὴν ἀποικίαν*> *ὀλίγοι ὄντες πολλῶν.*

7. **περὶ πολλοῦ . . ποιεῦνται**: cp. 6. 104, 7. 181, 8. 40 *supra.*

9. **ἐκ θεοπροπίου τινός**, 'in consequence of a certain prophetic (or divine) utterance'—*ἐκ* is here rather causal than temporal. *θεοπρόπιον* is an Homeric word, much used by Hdt. for an oracular response; so *θεοπρόπος* is with him always used for 'consultants' of an oracle. Just below the Apolloniates are found consulting both at Dodona and at Delphi.

ἀπὸ . . ἑκάς: cp. 3. 41 *ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου ἑκὰς ἐγένετο . .*

10. **τότε**: the time above referred to in *κατέλαβε πρῆγμα τοιόνδε.*

11. **κατακοιμήσαντος φυλακήν**: the accusative may be of temporal duration, or, more generally, of limitation; the verb is used in a transitive sense 8. 134 *supra.*

παρελθόντες λύκοι ἐς τὸ ἄντρον. Evenios was asleep outside, and the wolves got past him into the cave; cp. 3. 72 *ὑμεῖς δὲ ἴστε φυλακὰς τὰς κατεστεώσας ἐούσας οὐδὲν χαλεπὰς παρελθεῖν*: cp. 3. 77. Here one might have expected *παρεσελθόντες.*

13. **ὡς ἐπήισε**, 'when he perceived (it).' The verb occurs in a still more

ἀντικαταστήσειν ἄλλα πριάμενος. καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἔλαθε τοὺς Ἀπολλωνιήτας ταῦτα γενόμενα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπύθοντο, ὑπαγαγόντες μιν ὑπὸ δικαστήριον κατέκριναν, ὡς τὴν φυλακὴν κατακοιμήσαντα, τῆς ὄψιος στερηθῆναι. ἐπείτε δὲ τὸν Εὐήνιον ἐξετύφλωσαν, αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα οὔτε πρόβατά σφι ἔτικτε οὔτε γῆ ἔφερε ὁμοίως καρπόν. πρόφαντα δέ σφι ἔν τε Δωδώνῃ καὶ ἐν Δελφοῖσι ἐγίνετο, ἐπείτε ἐπειρώτων [τοὺς

15 *γινόμενα* B || *ἀλλ' ὡς* : *ὡς δὲ* S : *ἀλλά κως*? Stein[1 2] || *ὑπάγοντες* **B** 16 *ὑπὸ* : *εἰς τὸ* Paris. 1635 : *ἐς τὸ* z || *κατέκριναν* om. **B** || *κατακοιμίσαντα* R, Reiske, Holder, van H. : sed verba *ὡς . . κατακοιμίσαντα* susp. habet van H. 18 *τὰ πρόβατα* S 19 *καρπόν* om. **B**, Holder || *πρόφαντα* : *πρόβατα* **B** 20 *ἐγένετο* **B** || *ἐπείτε* Reiske : *ἔπειτα* || *ἔπειτα . . ἔφραζον* del. Krueger : *τοὺς προφήτας* et *οἳ δὲ αὐτοῖσι ἔφραζον* del. Stein, Holder, van H. || *ἐπειρώτευν* Marc., Gaisford, Stein[1] : *ἐπηρώτευν* CP : *ἐπερώτευν* z

generalized sense in 3. 29 *ἐπαΐοντες σιδηρίων*, 'sensible of steel.'

εἶχε σιγῇ, 'kept quiet,' silent, rather than *rem clam tenebat* or *tacuit* (the normal construction of *ἔχειν* with adverb, cp. Index). *σιγῇ*, as 8. 66, 74, still more 7. 237 (cp. also 2. 140). *σιγὴν ἔχειν* 1. 86, literally.

ἐν νόῳ ἔχων, 'intending . .'

15. **ταῦτα γενόμενα**, 'what had happened.'

ὑπαγαγόντες μιν ὑπὸ δικαστήριον : cp. 6. 104 *ὑπὸ δ. αὐτὸν ἀγαγόντες*, 6. 136 *θανάτου ὑπαγαγὼν ὑπὸ τὸν δῆμον Μιλτιάδεα*, 6. 72 *ὑπὸ δικαστήριον ὑπαχθείς*.

17. **τῆς ὄψιος στερηθῆναι** : on the principle that the punishment should fit the crime. *ὄψις*=*ὄμματα*, as in Aristot. *Hist. An.* 8. 19. 7 *λευκὴν ἔχοντες τὴν ὄψιν*. Polybius goes further : 3. 79. 12 *ἐστερήθη τῆς μιᾶς ὄψεως*. *ὄψις* is also used for the *chose vue* (as we say, a 'sight'), cp. 7. 15, 8. 54 *supra*, 3. 65. The two extremely concrete meanings correspond to the two primary and more abstract meanings of *ὄψις*, viz. the faculty of seeing, 4. 81, and the aspect or appearance, 7. 47.

18. **ἐξετύφλωσαν** is logically a pluperfect of time.

αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα, 'immediately thereupon.'

οὔτε πρόβατα κτλ. : cp. 6. 139 *οὔτε γῆ καρπὸν ἔφερε οὔτε γυναῖκές τε καὶ ποῖμναι ὁμοίως ἔτικτον καὶ πρὸ τοῦ.* This was, of course, the result of a curse (cp. 3. 65, the blessing and the curse of Kambyses on the Persians). Here the *γυναῖκες* are not included. (Economically this might only make things worse—though the Greek god, or historian, was hardly thinking of that.)

19. **πρόφαντα δέ σφι ἔν τε Δωδώνῃ καὶ ἐν Δελφοῖσι ἐγίνετο**, 'it was foreshown to them at Dodona and at Delphi.' *πρόφαντος* occurs also 5. 63 (and twice in Sophokl. *Trach.* 1159, 1163). The city had doubtless been founded under Delphic auspices, cp. c. 93 *supra* Dodona fills a larger place in the earliet Books of Herodotos, esp. 2. 52, a passage which proves a personal visit by the historian to the place. It is here mentioned purely *en passant*, and no doubt taken over from the source, whatever it was, of the story of Evenios ; and there is nothing in the notice to suggest that this passage was penned after Hdt.'s visit—rather the reverse ; nothing in fact to lead us to date the composition of this passage other than early in the genesis of the work.

Strabo 327–8 treats at length of Dodona ; Steph. Byz. devotes his longest article thereto. The Dodona in question here is, of course, the Thesprotian (cp. 4. 33), or oldest Greek oracle, which had seemingly been eclipsed by Delphi, though the tribes and cities of the neighbourhood naturally resorted thereto. It was destined to something like a revival at a later time, when Delphi was in difficulties, and during the Roman period, when all this district rose in importance. The method, or methods, of divination practised at Dodona are obscure ; upon the whole subject cp. Carapanos, *Dodone et ses ruines*, Paris, 1878.

προφήτας] τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ παρεόντος κακοῦ, [οἳ δὲ αὐτοῖσι ἔφραζον] ὅτι ἀδίκως τὸν φύλακον τῶν ἱρῶν προβάτων Εὐήνιον τῆς ὄψιος ἐστέρησαν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐπορμῆσαι τοὺς λύκους, οὐ πρότερόν τε παύσεσθαι τιμωρέοντες ἐκείνῳ πρὶν ἢ δίκας δῶσι τῶν ἐποίησαν ταύτας τὰς ἂν αὐτὸς ἕληται [καὶ δικαιοῖ]· τούτων δὲ ἐπιτελεομένων αὐτοὶ δώσειν Εὐηνίῳ δόσιν τοιαύτην
94 τὴν πολλούς μιν μακαριεῖν ἀνθρώπων ἔχοντα. τὰ μὲν χρηστήρια ταῦτά σφι ἐχρήσθη, οἱ δὲ Ἀπολλωνιῆται ἀπόρρητα ποιησάμενοι προσέθεσαν τῶν ἀστῶν ἀνδράσι διαπρῆξαι. οἳ δέ σφι διέπρηξαν ὧδε· κατημένου Εὐηνίου ἐν θώκῳ ἐλθόντες

---

22 ἱρῶν om. C || Εὐήνιον susp. habet Kallenberg 23 ἐς τοὺς C 24 παύσασθαι **B** || τιμωρέοντας R(S)V || ἐκείνῳ om. S || δώσειν ABCSV 25 ἕλοιτο Marc. || ἕληται καὶ secl. Cobet, Holder, van H. || καὶ δικαιοῖ secl. Blakesley, Stein[2] 26 τουτέων z || ἐπιτελεομένων Stein[(2) 3] : τελεομένων Stein[1], Holder, van H. : τελεουμένων Marc. || δόσιν εὐηνίω δώσειν R : δώσειν εὐηνίω δίκην Marc. **94.** 3 προσέθεσαν Cobet, van H., Stein[3] : προέθεσαν || ἀστέων z || ἀνδράσι <τρισὶ> Gomperz 4 ὧιδε P

---

21. **τὸ αἴτιον**, 'the cause'; this use of the word is observable. Cp. 7. 125. *τοὺς προφήτας* is inconsistent with 2. 55 and with 8. 36. Stein suggests that the corrector misunderstood *αὐτοί* and followed the lead of *πρόφαντα*. But see below.

22. **φύλακον**: the form is constant in Hdt. (*φύλαξ* is found 1. 41, in a somewhat different sense.)

23. **αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐπορμῆσαι τοὺς λύκους**: the plural (*αὐτοί*) is remarkable, as associating Zeus and Apollon in the joint action, Dodona and Delphi in a common utterance; a curious collaboration, an improbable coincidence, is suggested by these Responses, which is not much eased by remembering that there was a *Ζεὺς Λυκαῖος* as well as an *Ἀπόλλων Λύκειος* in the Greek Pantheon. Even Kroisos was not favoured to this extent (1. 46–49) unless indeed we are to infer that Apollon and Amphiaraos exactly coincided on that occasion. Are we to suppose collusion, genuine inspiration, or false report, as the source of this coincidence? Or is the record an inexact one; did the one oracle merely confirm the other, as if, for example, the Apolloniates might have inquired first at Dodona, and then, dissatisfied with the reply, have gone to Delphi only to get it reaffirmed there? (Cp. the action of Agesipolis at Olympia and Delphi in 388 B.C. (390?) Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 7. 2.)

αὐτοί must, of course, refer to the gods, whether we keep *τοὺς προφήτας* above or not. The proposal to cut out *τοὺς προφήτας* on the ground that it is inconsistent with 2. 55 (of Dodona) and with 8. 36 (of Delphi) is vitiated by the assumption that Hdt. is a careful and self-consistent writer. But further, a *προφήτης* is mentioned for Delphi in 8. 37, and in 2. 55 we have to reckon not merely with the three female *προμάντιες* or *ἱρεῖαι*, but with *οἱ ἄλλοι Δωδωναῖοι* (cp. 4. 33); while Homer shows that originally men (the *Σελλοί*) were the prophets, or priests, of the god in Dodona, and Strabo 402 declares that to the end *Βοιωτοῖς μόνοις ἄνδρας προθεσπίζειν ἐν Δωδώνῃ*. The *ἱρεῖαι* anyway had not everything their own way. Possibly if Hdt. had been in Dodona before writing this passage he would have expressed himself differently: the failure to specify the *Πυθίη* for Delphi might in any case be merely a bit of careless composition.

24. **τιμωρέοντες ἐκείνῳ.** The verb is used of bringing aid to the living 7. 169, or vengeance to the dead 7. 144, etc. This long prose Response badly wants reducing to verse!

25. **ταύτας**: the pronoun seems to refer to the future, the compensation still to be specified.

26. **δώσειν δόσιν**, cognate accus.

94. 2. **ταῦτα** is virtually predicative.

ἐχρήσθη, 7. 144 *supra*.

ἀπόρρητα ποιησάμενοι, c. 45 *supra*.

4. **ἐν θώκῳ**: no doubt in a public

οἱ παρίζοντο καὶ λόγους ἄλλους ἐποιεῦντο, ἐς ὃ κατέβαινον συλλυπεύμενοι τῷ πάθεϊ· ταύτῃ δὲ ὑπάγοντες εἰρώτων τίνα δίκην ἂν ἕλοιτο, εἰ ἐθέλοιεν Ἀπολλωνιῆται δίκας ὑποστῆναι [δώσειν] τῶν ἐποίησαν. ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀκηκοὼς τὸ θεοπρόπιον εἵλετο εἴπας εἴ τίς οἱ δοίη ἀγρούς, τῶν ἀστῶν ὀνομάσας τοῖσι ἠπίστατο εἶναι καλλίστους δύο κλήρους τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀπολλωνίῃ, καὶ οἴκησιν πρὸς τούτοισι τὴν ᾔδεε καλλίστην ἐοῦσαν τῶν ἐν πόλι· τούτων δὲ ἔφη ἐπήβολος γενόμενος τοῦ λοιποῦ ἀμήνιτος εἶναι, καὶ δίκην οἱ ταύτην ἀποχρᾶν γενομένην. καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεγε, οἱ δὲ πάρεδροι εἶπαν ὑπολαβόντες "Εὐήνιε, ταύτην δίκην Ἀπολλωνιῆται τῆς ἐκτυφλώσιος ἐκτίνουσί τοι κατὰ θεοπρόπια τὰ γενόμενα." ὁ μὲν δὴ πρὸς ταῦτα δεινὰ ἐποίεε, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν πυθόμενος τὸν πάντα λόγον, ὡς ἐξαπατη-

6 *συλλυπούμενοι* S || *εἰρώτεον* Marc., Stein[1] : *ἠρώτων* C : *ἠρώτεον* Pz 8 *δώσειν* secl. Stein[2] 12 *πόλει* **a**C : *τῇ πόλει* Marc. : *τη πόλι* z || *τουτέων* z || *ἔφη* abesse malit van H. || *ἐπίβολος* BS 13 <*ἂν*> *ἀμήνιτος* van H., Holder 15 *τοι* : *τε* CS 16 *κατὰ τὰ* z, van H. || *γινόμενα* B 17 *ἐποίεε, τὸ* : Stein[2], van H. (*ἐποίει, τὸ*) : *ἐποιέετο*

place, an *exedra*, or what not; cp. 1. 181, 6. 63.

5. **λόγους ἄλλους ἐποιεῦντο**, 'conversed (were conversing) about other (indifferent) matters . .'

ἐς ὅ: *donec.*

κατέβαινον συλλυπεύμενοι τῷ πάθεϊ, 'they came round (down) to expressing sympathy with his case'; cp. 1. 90 *λέγων δὲ ταῦτα κατέβαινε αὖτις παραιτεόμενος κτλ.*: cp. 1. 116, 118 *ὡς οἱ ἐπαλιλλόγητο κατέβαινε λέγων ὡς κτλ.* *πάθος*, of course, the loss of his eyes.

6. **ὑπάγοντες**: in a different sense to *ὑπαγαγόντες* c. 93 *supra*; here, 'drawing him on' furtively, or little by little; cp. *ἐξαπατηθείς infra.* **ὑποστῆναι**, to undertake; cp. c. 34 *supra.*

8. **τὸ θεοπρόπιον** = *τὰ χρηστήρια supra.*

10. **καλλίστους δύο κλήρους τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀπολλωνίῃ**: these two allotments must have been *ἐν τῇ χώρῃ*. The 'dwelling' (**οἴκησις**) was no doubt *ἐν* (*τῇ*) *πόλι*.

12. **ἐπήβολος**: cp. 8. 111 *supra.*

τοῦ λοιποῦ: sc. *χρόνου*, cp. 8. 143. 11 and c. 90. 1 *supra.*

13. **ἀμήνιτος**: *μῆνις*, generally of supernatural wrath, is here applied by the diviner to his own feeling, which, no doubt, is conceived as having a touch of the uncanny about it. (The *ι* is long.)

ἀποχρᾶν: *satisfacere*, cp. c. 48 *supra.*

14. **πάρεδροι** = *παριζόμενοι*: cp. 5. 18 *γυναῖκας ἐσάγεσθαι παρέδρους* (i.e. *παρακατεδευμένας*), or 6. 65 *πάρεδροι ἐόντες* = *παριζόμενοι.*

ὑπολαβόντες, took him up, or took up the conversation, as frequently; 7. 101, etc. (*λόγον*).

15. **τῆς ἐκτυφλώσιος**: with gen. cp. *δίκας τῶν* 1. 8 *supra.* *ἐκτύφλωσις* is a hapaxlegomenon.

16. **τὰ θεοπρόπια** = *τὰ χρηστήρια supra.*

δεινὰ ἐποίεε: cp. App. Crit., but he very probably 'made a great ado,' a great fuss, not merely took it sorely to heart. The active is good here; cp. 2. 121, *δεινὰ ποιέειν* 7. 1 *supra.*

17. **τὸν πάντα λόγον**, 'the whole story,' i.e. the real facts. He had been tricked (*ἐξαπατηθείς*). The trick is indicative of a relatively low standard of morality, which keeps the pledge in the letter, and breaks it in the spirit, and is characteristic of a certain type of culture, or education, which unites a scrupulous conscience with a good deal of essential dishonesty; cp. 4. 154, 201, etc. etc. In this case, however, there was a difficulty: had Evenios known the whole story, he might have been sorely tempted into extravagant demands. The gods plainly condoned the trick, and consoled the diviner with a gift which brought him honour, and doubtless proved extremely profitable to him and his descendants.

θείς· οἱ δὲ πριάμενοι παρὰ τῶν ἐκτημένων διδοῦσί οἱ τὰ εἵλετο. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτίκα ἔμφυτον μαντικὴν εἶχε, ὥστε καὶ ὀνομαστὸς γενέσθαι.

95 *τούτου δὴ ὁ Δηίφονος ἐὼν παῖς τοῦ Εὐηνίου ἀγόντων Κορινθίων ἐμαντεύετο τῇ στρατιῇ. ἤδη δὲ καὶ τόδε ἤκουσα, ὡς ὁ Δηίφονος ἐπιβατεύων τοῦ Εὐηνίου οὐνόματος ἐξελάμβανε ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔργα, οὐκ ἐὼν Εὐηνίου παῖς.*

96 *Τοῖσι δὲ Ἕλλησι ὡς ἐκαλλιέρησε, ἀνῆγον τὰς νέας ἐκ τῆς Δήλου πρὸς τὴν Σάμον. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐγένοντο τῆς Σαμίης πρὸς*

---

18 *κεκτημένων* C   20 *καὶ* om. Marc. || *οὐνομαστὸν* S : *οὐνομαστὸς* z **95.** 1 *δὴ ὁ* om. **B**   2 *τοῦ Εὐηνίου* suspect. hab. van H. || *ἀγαγόντων* **B**, van H.   3 *ὁ* om. **B** || *ἐπιβατεύων* post *Εὐηνίου* Marc. : *ἐπιβατέων* B¹R(S)V || *ὀνόματος* R(S)VPMarc., van H.   4 *ἐπὶ* : *ἐπιὼν* Reiske || *ἔργῳ* Ask.   **96.** 1 *νῆας* z

---

18. **οἱ δέ**: sc. *οἱ Ἀπολλωνιῆται.*

19. **μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτ.**: cp. c. 77. 1 *supra.*

ἔμφυτον μαντικήν: this was the *δόσις* promised by Zeus and Apollon, c. 93 *ad f.* This talent of divination as *ἔμφυτος* was (*a*) not acquired from a human master, (*b*) hereditary, transmissible. Cp. Demosth. *de Cor.* 203 *οὐκ ἦν ταῦθ' ὡς ἔοικε τοῖς τότε Ἀθηναίοις πατρια . . οὐδ' ἔμφυτα.*

εἶχε, 'became possessed of.' Wesseling well cps. *Od.* 22. 347 *αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἴμας παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν.*

95. 1. **ἐὼν παῖς.** Hdt. appears to prefer the view that Deiphonos was true son to Evenios; but there was a doubt on the subject: why? Was Deiphonos too old to be the son of Evenios, or to have been born after the date of Evenios' acquisition of *μαντική*? The date of the events just related is not indicated by Hdt., but the sceptical doubt as to his paternity may have been based upon chronological grounds. The doubt may have been started by rivals, diviners, Athenian or other.

2. **ἀγόντων Κορινθίων**, Apollonia being a Korinthian colony; cp. c. 93 *supra.*

ἤδη δὲ . . ἤκουσα: the same formula 7. 55 *supra*, introducing an alternative not credited by the historian himself. The passage here looks like an addition, perhaps of later date.

3. **ἐπιβατεύων τοῦ Εὐηνίου οὐνόματος.** Cf. 3. 63 *ἐπιβατεύων τοῦ Σμέρδιος οὐνόματος*, with a slight difference, the Mage calling himself Smerdis, Deiphonos calling his father Evenios, or Evenios his father. In either case, however, there is the usurpation of a name, the usurper taking advantage of a name to get (or give himself) 'a lift'; cp. also 6. 65 *ἐπιβατεύων τοῦ ῥήματος.*

4. **ἐξελάμβανε**: as Blakesley (after Schweighaeuser) observes, *ἐκλαμβάνειν elocare* may be the correlative of *ἐκδοῦναι locare*; he 'undertook,' was undertaking, to perform works (*ἔργα*), sc. of divination.

ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα: the preposition is curious, suggesting 'against,' which would here be senseless; Schweighaeuser (*Lexicon*) defends it, and explains *passim per Graeciam*: *ἀνά* would be more usual, but Stein cites Homer, *Od.* 16. 63 *πολλὰ βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἄστεα δινηθῆναι*, etc. etc. (cp. 4. 417 *ὅσσ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἑρπετὰ γίγνονται*); cp. *ἐπὶ πολλόν* 8. 107 *supra.*

96. 1. **ὡς ἐκαλλιέρησε**: sc. *τὰ ἱρά*, cp. c. 19 *supra.* Doubtless in the fleet also the victims had been slow to reveal the favourable sign until the moment for advance was come, not earlier than the evacuation of Attica by Mardonios surely; cp. c. 13 *supra.*

ἀνῆγον τὰς νέας: cp. 8. 76 *supra*; the move from Delos to Samos marks the assumption of the offensive by the Greeks at sea, even more decisively than the move into Boiotia the assumption of the offensive by land; c. 19 *supra.*

2. **πρὸς τὴν Σ.**, of motion, but not hostile motion, to . .

ἐγένοντο τῆς Σαμίης πρὸς †Καλαμίσοισι: they reached (came to rest at) Kalamisa in Samian territory; Athenaeus 572 f. *Ἄλεξις δ' ὁ Σάμιος ἐν δευτέρῳ Ὥρων*

Καλαμίσοισι, οἳ μὲν αὐτοῦ ὁρμισάμενοι κατὰ τὸ Ἥραιον τὸ ταύτῃ παρεσκευάζοντο ἐς ναυμαχίην, οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι πυθόμενοι σφέας προσπλέειν ἀνῆγον καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς τὴν ἤπειρον τὰς νέας τὰς ἄλλας, τὰς δὲ Φοινίκων ἀπῆκαν ἀποπλέειν. βουλευο-

---

3 *λαμίοισιν* **B** : Καλάμοισι Larcher, Gaisford, Holder, van H., ex Athenaeo p. 572 F || *ὁρμισάμενοι* z : *ὡρμισάμενοι* Marc. : *ὁρμησάμενοι* ceteri || *ἡραῖον* R 4 *ὡς ἐς* z || *πυθόμενοι σφέας* B, Stein[2] : *πυθόμενοί σφεας* Stein[1], Holder, van H. 6 *νῆας* z || *ἀποπλώειν* van H.

<Ὥρων> Σαμιακῶν τὴν ἐν Σάμῳ Ἀφροδίτην, ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐν Καλάμοις καλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐν Ἕλει, Ἀττικαὶ φησὶν ἑταῖραι ἱδρύσαντο αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι Περικλεῖ ὅτε ἐπολιόρκει τὴν Σάμον. This is the only passage where a name resembling what is here in evidence occurs associated with Samos. It suggests three conclusions: (*a*) that the name of the place was *Κάλαμοι*, 'the Reeds' (cp. the variant *ἕλος*); (*b*) that it was a natural place for an enemy's fleet to attempt a landing at; (*c*) that the temple here referred to was not an Heraion but an Aphrodision, though not, of course, one founded as late as 440–39 B.C. The origin and foundation of the temple, described by Alexis, is not convincing, though dedications, anathemata, there may have been from the occasion and the persons described.

3. **τὸ Ἥραιον τὸ ταύτῃ**: the expression seems to suggest that 'the Heraion in this place' is distinguished from an Heraion in some other. There may, of course, have been more than one Heraion in Samos; but there appears to be no independent evidence to prove the existence of more than one. If the great Heraion (3. 60) be here intended, the addition of the words *τὸ ταύτῃ* is rather perplexing. (Could they signify not the Heraion of Kalamoi in contrast with another Heraion also in Samos, but simply the Samian Heraion as distinguished from the Argive, the Olympian, or any other?) The position of the Heraion would seem suitable to the story in this chapter. The temple was on the sea-coast, at some distance from the city, and on a flat plain; cp. H. F. Tozer, *Islands of the Aegean* (1890) p. 175.

5. **ἀνῆγον . . πρὸς τὴν ἤπειρον**: the *ἀνάπλους* is reckoned as from Samos; in relation to the mainland it was a *κατάπλους*. It appears presently that the Persians went SE. as for Miletos, not NE. as for Ephesos. They were well served by their intelligence department, and had timely notice of the advance of the Greek fleet from Delos.

6. **τὰς δὲ Φοινίκων ἀπῆκαν ἀποπλέειν.** Hdt. apparently means that while the rest of the Persian fleet retired on the mainland, close by, the Phoenician squadron or contingent was sent to sail right away—exactly whither he does not indicate. Others supply the omission—home. This statement in any form is a major crux. That the Phoenician fleet was clean dismissed to save it from a battle, and in the presence of the enemy, is scarce credible. If it was at Samos in the spring of 480 B.C. it would have retired on the mainland and helped to defend the fortified camp on Mykale; or, if detached from the rest of the fleet, it would have been employed on some special service—an advance on the Kyklades, left exposed by the Greeks, or more probably to operate upon the rear of the Greek force, or to attack the ships, after the greater part of the Greek forces had been drawn on to the mainland, and induced to debark.

Hdt. can hardly be understood as meaning that the Phoenician ships had been dismissed (*ἀπῆκαν* aorist pluperfect!) in the winter ("schon im Winter," Stein) home. That may have been the case; but if so, Hdt. does not know it.

Domaszewski has suggested that the Phoenician (and Egyptian) fleets were really all the time on service off Thrace, Makedon, Thessaly, protecting the coasts, and attending to the commissariat of Mardonios. But Hdt. does account for the 'Egyptians' (c. 32 *supra*); and if the Phoenicians were in the Thrakian sea, why did they not support or cover Sestos? Or how did they get away? If the Phoenicians are withdrawn from the Persian fleet at Samos, and the Egyptians likewise, what remains? Very little except Greek vessels, or quasi-Greek (Kypriote), whose loyalty

μένοισι γάρ σφι ἐδόκεε ναυμαχίην μὴ ποιέεσθαι· οὐ γὰρ ὦν ἐδόκεον ὅμοιοι εἶναι. ἐς δὲ τὴν ἤπειρον <ἀνῆγον>, ὅκως ἔωσι ὑπὸ τὸν πεζὸν στρατὸν τὸν σφέτερον ἐόντα ἐν τῇ Μυκάλῃ, ὃς κελεύσαντος Ξέρξεω καταλελειμμένος τοῦ ἄλλου στρατοῦ

---

8 *ὁμοῖοι* CP Marc. z : valde suspect. habet van H. || <*ἀνῆγον*> Stein[3] : *ἀπέπλεον* **B**, Stein[1 2], Holder : *ἀπέπλωον* van H. : om. **a**C Marc. 9 *στρατὸν σφέτερον* Marc. || *μυκάλλῃ* S

---

to Persia certainly could not be trusted at this juncture. Had the Phoenicians been present, yet the Persian admirals would hardly have risked a sea-battle in Greek waters, even with the memory of Lade to back them. Cp. Appendix VII. § 1. Hdt.'s rationale or motivation for the retirement upon the mainland, and the dismissal of the Phoenician contingent, is presumably an inference from the facts, but a not unreasonable inference; the Persian admirals felt they were not equal to fighting a battle at sea with the Greeks (**ὅμοιοι** = *ἀξιόμαχοι*); and they desired to obtain the cover (**ὑπό**, cp. 8. 92 *supra*) and coöperation of the large land-army, which was holding Ionia. But Hdt. fails to explain why the Persians were not *ἀξιόμαχοι* at sea (absence of the Phoenicians, etc., suspect loyalty of the Ionians, etc.); and he certainly credits them with no ulterior intention or hope of luring the Greeks on to the mainland, into the clutches of the *corps d'armée*.

9. **ἐν τῇ Μυκάλῃ.** Mykale has been described c. 90 *supra* simply as *τῆς Ἰωνίης* (assuming the text to be there complete, at least so far as this point is concerned). The mention of Mykale in 7. 80 is merely *en passant*, and does not prejudice the problem of composition in any way. It is more significant that no geographical description of Mykale occurs in this Book, whereas such a description is given in Bk. 1. 148 (*ἡ δὲ Μυκάλη ἐστὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ἄκρη πρὸς ζέφυρον ἄνεμον κατήκουσα Σάμῳ καταντίον*): how is such a sequence to be reconciled with the hypothesis that these Books (7–9) are the earliest portion of Hdt.'s work drafted by him, and in particular that Bk. 9 is of older composition than Bk. 1? The answer is not really difficult. (*a*) Mykale was a locality famous in this story, and Hdt. has not paused to describe it expressly; at the same time incidentally the topography of the place is here in evidence. (*b*) The passage in Bk. 1 occurs in an eminently descriptive passage, where a topographical note was obviously in order. (*c*) Hdt. had probably in writing the early Books of his history a western, or at least a larger, audience more distinctly in view than when he first sat down to write the annals of the great invasion; it is to this wider public that the large amount of geography in Bks. 1–4 is addressed. (*d*) The whole context in 1. 148 forbids the supposition that in describing Mykale there he has the battle of 479 B.C. in view; and equally in this place the total absence of any back reference to 1. 148 is noticeable. As far as this story was concerned he was content originally with the simple indication *τῆς Ἰωνίης* c. 90 *supra*; that, indeed, would have been superfluous if he had had 1. 148 in view. (*e*) It is also observable that in 6. 16 Mykale is mentioned as requiring no description whatever. The explanation there is probably not that he has the description in 1. 148 in view, but that he is following an Ionian source in the account of the Ionian revolt, and that the source took Mykale for granted. Mykale is, however, here both expressly and incidentally more fully described than there; though that passage now precedes this in the opus.

10. **κελεύσαντος Ξέρξεω**, 'by order of Xerxes'; the particularity of this statement is remarkable. It exhibits, of course, the king as commander-in-chief, but does not specify the precise point of time at which this order had been issued. Was it part of a general plan, devised or sanctioned by the king, during his first residence at Sardes, in 481–80 B.C.? Or was it an afterthought, dictated (possibly by personal apprehension) during his second residence in Sardes, after his return, his 'flight' from Europe? Ionia cannot have been denuded of troops when Xerxes advanced into Europe; and the

Ἰωνίην ἐφύλασσε· τοῦ πλῆθος μὲν ἦν ἓξ μυριάδες, ἐστρατήγεε
δὲ αὐτοῦ Τιγράνης κάλλεϊ καὶ μεγάθεϊ ὑπερφέρων Περσέων.
ὑπὸ τοῦτον μὲν δὴ τὸν στρατὸν ἐβουλεύσαντο καταφυγόντες
οἱ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατηγοὶ ἀνειρύσαι τὰς νέας καὶ περιβαλέ-
σθαι ἕρκος ἔρυμά <τε> τῶν νεῶν καὶ σφέων αὐτῶν κρησφύ-
γετον. ταῦτα βουλευσάμενοι ἀνήγοντο. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ παρὰ **97**
τὸ τῶν Ποτνιέων ἱρὸν τῆς Μυκάλης ἐς Γαίσωνά τε <ποταμὸν>

---

11 *ἰωνίην τε* R || *πλήθεος* **β** 12 *κάλλει* AB : *κάλλεΐ τε z*, van H. || *μεγέθει* **α** 13 *ὑπὸ* : *ἐπὶ z* 14 *οἱ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατηγοὶ* om. S || *νῆας z* 15 *ἔρημα* S || *τε* add. Stein, van H. || *καί σφεων* AB : *κέσφεων* R || *αὐτέων z* **97.** 1 *παρὰ τῶν Ποτνιέων τὸ ἱρὸν?* Kallenberg 2 *μυκάλλης* S || *γέσωνά* R : *γέσονά* Marc. || *τε* : *τε ποταμὸν?* Stein[2] : verbum inserui, cf. comment. infra

---

words **καταλελειμμένος τοῦ ἄλλου στρατοῦ** are more than compatible with the view that this force had been left behind the main force, when the latter passed over the bridge in 480 B.C., though the words are generally interpreted (as Hdt. perhaps understood them) as meaning 'retained after the rest of the forces, which had returned from Europe, were dismissed (like the Phoenicians !) to their own homes.'

11. **ἓξ μυριάδες**: 60,000 as the (nominal) strength of the *corps d'armée* in Ionia is an eminently luciferous item, and confirms other suggestions in regard to the organization of the Persian forces. This army, or *corps d'armée*, presumably comprises six Myriads, under six Myriarchs, perhaps five of infantry, and one of cavalry; and it exactly tallies, in number, with the army of Artabazos 8. 126 *supra*. Cp. Appendix II. § 5.

12. **Τιγράνης**. This Tigranes is the *ἀνὴρ Ἀχαιμενίδης* who one year before, if 7. 62 is to be trusted, was *ἄρχων* of the Medes. (Cp. also 8. 26.) He had still perhaps his Medes with him (but cp. 8. 113, and c. 31 *supra*). He is now *ὁ τοῦ πεζοῦ στρατηγός*, i.e. in supreme command of a *corps d'armée*, by promotion; he is killed in the ensuing action c. 102 *supra*. Hdt. himself takes no account of the previous mention, or mentions, of him (so independent is story of story, and source of source). In describing Tigranes as *<ἀνὴρ> κάλλεϊ καὶ μεγάθεϊ ὑπερφέρων Περσέων* Hdt. has also perhaps forgotten his own previous eulogy of Xerxes 7. 187 *supra*. **ὑπερφέρειν**: cp. 8. 138 *supra*.

15. **ἔρυμα· κρησφύγετον**: cp. c. 15 *supra*.

97. 1. **ἀνήγοντο**: middle, and so without *τὰς νέας*: cp. c. 96 *ad init.*

2. **τὸ τῶν Ποτνιέων ἱρόν.** The term *πότνια* is found applied to many a goddess together with the name proper, cp. 8. 77 *supra*, but as here, absolutely, to Demeter and Kore only, Sophokl. *O. K.* 1050. (The *πότνιαι δεινῶπες ib.* 84 are plainly the Eumenides; but *πότνιαι* there is not absolute.) Perhaps, then, the temple here mentioned was dedicated to the Mother and Child; though it cannot be identical with the *Δήμητρος Ἐλευσινίης ἱρόν*, presently to be mentioned. There was an old Boiotian town named Ποτνιαί, Pausan. 9. 8. 1, between the Asopos and Thebes, where the Mother and the Maid were worshipped (with remarkable rites). The passage in Pausanias is unfortunately corrupt, but the town-name may naturally be connected with this title of the goddesses in question. There would be nothing curious in finding a Boiotian title (i.e. a prae-Boiotian or old Ionian title from Boiotia) reproduced on Mykale; Mykale was the centre of the worship of Helikonian 'Potidan' (cp. 1. 148).

Γαίσωνά τε <ποταμὸν> καὶ Σκολοπόεντα. The Gaison was the stream on which Priene was situate, Ephoros *Fr.* 91 (= Athenaeus 311 E), apparently forming, or emptying into a lake, *ἡ Γαισωνὶς λίμνη*, between Priene and Miletos (Athen. *l.c.*, Pliny 5. 31. 3 *Gessus amnis*). Rawlinson, remarking that Hdt. "never introduces the name of a river without either calling it a river or prefixing the article," wants to make Gaison a town.

Σκολοπόεις does not occur elsewhere. Many commentators (Schweighaeuser, Larcher, *et al.*) have taken it (as well as Gaison) for a river-name. Stein points

καὶ Σκολοπόεντα, τῇ Δήμητρος Ἐλευσινίης ἱρόν, τὸ Φίλιστος ὁ Πασικλέος ἱδρύσατο Νείλεῳ τῷ Κόδρου ἐπισπόμενος ἐπὶ Μιλήτου κτιστύν, ἐνθαῦτα τάς τε νέας ἀνείρυσαν καὶ περιεβάλοντο ἕρκος καὶ λίθων καὶ ξύλων, δένδρεα ἐκκόψαντες ἥμερα, καὶ σκόλοπας περὶ τὸ ἕρκος κατέπηξαν, καὶ παρε-

---

3 *ἐστὶ(ν) ἱρόν* **B** 4 *Πασικλῆος* z || *νειλέω* R(S)V || *ἐπισπομένου* **a** Marc. 5 *κτιστὴν* R Marc. z || *τε* om. Marc. || *νῆας* z || *περιεβάλλοντο* S 6 *καὶ* ante *λίθων* om. S 7 *παρὰ* Marc. || *κατέκοψαν* R^t

---

out that the name was derived from the *σκόλοπες* mentioned below; it is no doubt a place-name, marking the position of the Persian fortification. If so, the name must be later than 479 B.C., though Hdt. gives no hint thereof, and seems to imply that the name was as old as the foundation of Miletos.

3. **Δήμητρος Ἐλευσινίης ἱρόν**: an indirect omen, had the Greeks but known it, of the coming victory; cp. c. 101 *infra*.

τὸ Φίλιστος ὁ Πασικλέος ἱδρύσατο. Pasikles recurs at Athens (and elsewhere) as a personal name, in the fourth century B.C. and after. The father of Philistos is not otherwise celebrated. The name *Φίλιστος* recurs before the end of the fifth century B.C. as that of the Syracusan historian, who witnessed the siege of Syracuse (414–13 B.C.), Plutarch, *Nik.* 19.

4. **Νείλεῳ τῷ Κόδρου**: 5. 65 and 1. 147 incidentally confirm this founder, without actually mentioning his name; *Νήλευς* is, however, the form of the name apparently implied in 5. 65 (for the father of Nestor; it is not likely that the son of Kodros should have spelt his name differently). *Marm. Par.* 27 has *Νε[ιλ]εὺς ᾤκισ[ε Μίλητον καὶ τὴν] ἄλ[λ]η[ν] ἅ[πα]σ[αν Ἰωνί]αν* (anno 1087 B.C.). (F. Jacoby, ed. 1904, reads *Νη[λ]εύς*.) Both forms obtain indifferently in MSS. The grave of Neleus was to be seen on the road to Didymi, Pausan. 7. 2. 6. Kodros was the son of Melanthos (1. 147), of Pylian and 'Neleid' extraction (5. 65), king of Athens (5. 76), in which capacity he resisted the Dorian invasion successfully; the legend of Kodros and his 'devotion' is fully developed in Lykurgos, *c. Leocrat.* 84–87, and was probably, although Hdt. does not expressly mention it, at least as old as the age of Peisistratos, who claimed kinship with the Neleids and Melanthids; cp. 5. 65.

ἐπὶ Μιλήτου κτιστύν. This notice of the foundation of Miletos, and of the temple of Eleusinian Demeter, the former by Neileus, or Neleus, son of Kodros, the latter by his companion Philistos, son of Pasikles, is presumably taken from the work of some logograph on *κτίσεις, κτίσιες*, or *κτιστύες*. Such a work was ascribed afterwards to one Kadmos of Miletos: *ὃς πρῶτος κατά τινας συγγραφὴν ἔγραψε καταλογάδην, μικρῷ νεώτερος Ὀρφέως. συνέταξε δὲ κτίσιν Μιλήτου καὶ τῆς ὅλης Ἰωνίας ἐν βιβλίοις δ'* (Suidas *sub v.*). To Charon of Lampsakos was also ascribed a work *κτίσεις πόλεων ἐν βιβλίοις β'*. (The reference to 'Books' shows that these works had been at least 'edited' much later than the dates of their ostensible authors: but then so were the ΛΟΓΟΙ of Hdt.) A sample of this kind of work, or of work founded thereon, may be seen in the accounts of the Ionian settlements, that of Neleus, or Neileus, at Miletos included, in Strabo 632–33 (citing 'Pherekydes') and Pausanias 7. 2.

The form *κτιστύς* belongs to a class of nouns common in Ionic prose, but confined in Attic to poetry; cp. Weir Smyth, *Gk. Dialects* (Ionic) § 497. 1, viz. nouns terminating in *-τύς*. The list given by Smyth may be supplemented from Baehr's note *in l.* (after Valckenaer). Hdt. 5. 6 has *λῃστύς*, 4. 75 *καταπλαστύς*.

6. **ἕρκος καὶ λίθων καὶ ξύλων**: some emphasis is lent to *λίθων* by the form of conjunction *καί—καί*. The *τεῖχος* of Mardonios on the Asopos (c. 15 *supra*) had probably no stones; here they would be easily procurable from Mykale and the seashore. *ἕρκος*, as in 6. 134, or c. 99 *infra*; differently 7. 85 *supra*.

δένδρεα ἐκκόψαντες ἥμερα: this was distinctly 'an unfriendly act' (cp. c. 15 *supra*), the rather in this case as Mykale was well-wooded (*ὄρος εὔθηρον καὶ εὔδενδρον* Strabo 636).

7. **σκόλοπας**, 'stakes,' 'pales'; very common for this purpose in Homer, *Il.*

σκευάδατο ὡς πολιορκησόμενοι καὶ ὡς νικήσοντες· [ἐπ' ἀμφότερα ἐπιλεγόμενοι γὰρ παρεσκευάζοντο.]

98 Οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ὡς ἐπύθοντο οἰχωκότας τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐς τὴν ἤπειρον, ἤχθοντο ὡς ἐκπεφευγότων ἀπορίῃ τε εἴχοντο ὅ τι ποιέωσι, εἴτε ἀπαλλάσσωνται ὀπίσω εἴτε καταπλέωσι ἐπ' Ἑλλησπόντου. τέλος δ' ἔδοξε τούτων μὲν μηδέτερα ποιέειν, ἐπιπλέειν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἤπειρον. παρασκευασάμενοι ὦν ἐς ναυμαχίην καὶ ἀποβάθρας καὶ ἄλλα ὅσων ἔδεε, ἔπλεον ἐπὶ τῆς Μυκάλης. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀγχοῦ τε ἐγίνοντο τοῦ στρατοπέδου

---

8 glossema delebam: amplius emendavit Stein[5], hoc scilicet modo: *ἐπ' ἀμφότερα γὰρ ἐπιλεγόμενοι παρεσκευάζοντο καὶ ὡς πολιορκησόμενοι καὶ ὡς νικήσοντες*: *καὶ ὡς . . παρεσκευάζοντο* del. Krueger: *γὰρ παρεσκευάζοντο* del. Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *ἐπ' ἀμφότερα ἐπιλεγόμενα* AC: *ἐπ' ἀμφότερα· ἐπιλεγόμενοι* ceteri   9 *παρεσκευάδατο* z   **98.** 2 *ἐν* (*ἀπορίῃ*) **B**, Holder, van H. || *ἤχοντο* R   3 *ὅ* om. **B**: *τι* om. Marc. || *ἀπαλλάσσονται* Marc.   4 *δὲ* R(S)V, Holder || *τουτέων* z || *μὲν*: *δὲ* R || *μηδ' ἕτερα* R   6 *τὰ ἄλλα* **B**, Holder || *ὅσον* R || *ἔπλεεν* R Marc.: *ἔπλωον* van H. || *ἐπὶ τὴν Μυκάλην* vel *ἐπὶ Μυκάλης* malit Kallenberg   7 *μυκάλλης* S || *ἐπείτε δὲ* vel *ἐπεὶ δὲ δή*? van H.

---

8. 343, 15. 1 (*διά τε σκόλοπας καὶ τάφρον ἔβησαν*), *Od.* 7. 44 *τείχεα μακρὰ ὑψηλά, σκολόπεσσιν ἀρηρότα.* Cp. 1. 3 *supra.*

παρεσκευάδατο: the temporal force can hardly be insisted on in this pluperfect. The passage is, however, corrupt, and Stein's later emendation would eliminate this word and leave *παρεσκευάζοντο* (less forcible). Cp. App. Crit. I prefer to regard *ἐπ' ἀμφότερα . . παρεσκευάζοντο* as the gloss: the Persians were not prepared for an alternative (*ἐπ' ἀμφότερα*), nor is a true alternative presented; they wish to stand a siege, and to issue therefrom victorious. The glossator has misunderstood the situation. The resolution of the Persian admirals to stand a siege can hardly be explained except by their distrust of the (Ionian) forces under their command, and also by the absence of the *corps d'armée*, and their expectation that it would come to their relief. They had, of course, under their command, the Medo-Persian *Epibatai*, 8. 130 *supra.*

9. **ἐπιλεγόμενοι**, if it stands, may be interpreted by *ἐπιλεξάμενος*, not in 8. 136 but in 5. 30.

98. 2. **ἤχθοντο ὡς ἐκπεφευγότων**: sc. *τῶν βαρβάρων.* The construction is not quite regular; cp. 8. 109 *ἐκπεφευγότων περιημέκτεον.*

ἀπορίῃ τε εἴχοντο ὅ τι ποιέωσι, 'were in doubt (at a loss) what to do'; the *agendum* is conceived of as future, the antecedent imperfect notwithstanding, hence the subjunctives. Three courses were open to them: (i.) to return to Delos, (ii.) to steer for the Hellespont, (iii.) to follow the Persians to the mainland at Mykale. The first is merely a logical alternative; the second might have drawn the Persian fleet after them, but was obviously rather speculative. The third course was under the circumstances the obvious one to take, and hardly required very much deliberation, especially if, as appears, they were still counting upon a sea-engagement. The *ἐπίπλοος* is distinctly militant and hostile: **ἐπὶ τὴν ἤπειρον.** The actual *πλόος* is merely geographical, **ἐπὶ τῆς Μυκάλης.**

6. **ἀποβάθραι** reappear in Thuc. 4. 12. 1 as 'landing-gangways'; here they must have been intended in the first instance for boarding the Persian ships.

7. **ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀγχοῦ τε . . καὶ οὐδείς . .**: a common form of parataxis; cp. 8. 37. **ἐπαναγόμενος**, 'putting out to sea against them.' **παρακεκριμένον**, cp. 8. 70. 2: *in acie stantem*, Baehr. **ἐγχρίμψας**, a not uncommon word with Hdt. and elsewhere transitive; cp. 2. 60 *τὴν βάριν τῇ γῇ*, also 2. 93, 3. 85, 4. 113.

καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐφαίνετό σφι ἐπαναγόμενος, ἀλλ' ὥρων νέας ἀνελκυσμένας ἔσω τοῦ τείχεος, πολλὸν δὲ πεζὸν παρακεκριμένον παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλόν, ἐνθαῦτα πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τῇ νηὶ παραπλέων, ἐγχρίμψας τῷ αἰγιαλῷ τὰ μάλιστα, Λευτυχίδης ὑπὸ κήρυκος προηγόρευε τοῖσι Ἴωσι λέγων "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, ὅσοι ὑμέων τυγχάνουσι ἐπακούοντες, μάθετε τὰ λέγω· πάντως γὰρ οὐδὲν συνήσουσι Πέρσαι τῶν ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἐντέλλομαι. ἐπεὰν συμμίσγωμεν, μεμνῆσθαι τινὰ χρὴ ἐλευθερίης μὲν πάντων πρῶτον, μετὰ δὲ τοῦ συνθήματος Ἥβης. καὶ τάδε ἴστω καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀκούσας ὑμέων πρὸς τοῦ ἀκούσαντος." [ὡυτὸς δὲ οὗτος ἐὼν τυγχάνει νόος τοῦ πρήγματος καὶ ὁ Θεμιστοκλέος ὁ ἐπ'

8 σφιν ἐφαίνετο **β**: ἐγένετό σφι Marc. || νῆας z 9 παρακεκρυμμένον S 11 ἐγκρίψας Cz || ταμάλιστα Pz 12 ὅσοι **β**, Holder, van H., Stein[3]: οἳ 13 μάθε R || πάντες Marc. 14 συμμισγῶμεν RSV 15 πάντων om. Ask. 16 Ἥρης Roscher, Holder 17 ἐσακούσας **α**C: ἐπακούσας Bekker, Holder, van H. || ἐπακούσαντος **β**, Holder, van H. || ὡυτὸς . . Ἕλλησι secl. Krueger, van H., Stein[3] || οὗτος: τούτου coni. Stein(2) 18 τυγχάνει: ἐτύγχανε requir. Krueger, van H. || πρήγματος: ῥήματος aut κηρύγματος? Stein || ὁ om. R || Θεμιστοκλῆος z

11. **ὑπὸ κήρυκος**, 'by the voice of a herald,' instrumental; but not quite parallel with *ὑπὸ μαστίγων* 7. 22, 56.

12. **τοῖσι Ἴωσι**, who probably furnished and manned the major part, if not the whole, of the Persian fleet on this occasion, the *Epibatai* excepted; cp. c. 97 *supra*.

14. **ἐπεὰν συμμίσγωμεν**: Hdt. characteristically makes nothing of the determination of the Greeks to effect a landing. They had advanced against the mainland only in the expectation of fighting a *ναυμαχίη*. The resolution to force a landing in the actual presence of a hostile force, in possession of the shore, is far more remarkable. This was more than the Persians themselves had attempted at Marathon, and certainly more than they could have effected. The Persians at Mykale were in a position to dispute the attempted landing of the Greeks (cp. the situation at Pylos in 425 B.C., Thucyd. 4. 11 ff.), and their failure to do so is best explained by their distrust of the Ionians. *συμμίσγειν*, as in 8. 22. 12, 4. 127, 6. 14, etc., of hostile encounter.

15. **τινὰ χρή**: cp. 8. 109. 19 *καί τις οἰκίην κτλ.*

16. **τοῦ συνθήματος Ἥβης**: *σύνθημα* is any preconcerted signal (cp. 8. 7. 10), or even the mere prearrangement itself (cp. 5. 75 *ἀπὸ συνθήματος*, 6. 121 *ἐκ σ.*). Here it is the 'password' (*Ἥβης* in apposition). Why *Ἥβη* should have been the *mot d'ordre* is not self-evident: there was no apparent local association to suggest it, but it need not be changed into *Ἥρης*, out of compliment to the Samians. Hebe is, indeed, in attendance upon Here, *Iliad* 5. 721 f., and on Ares, *ib.* 905, and in Hesiod, *Theog.* 922, 952, is daughter of Zeus and Here (and sister of Ares). Moreover, she is the bride of Herakles in heaven, *Od.* 11. 603, and so might well have charms for a Herakleid on earth. **μετὰ δέ** is, of course, adverbial: the genitives are regular, with *μεμνῆσθαι*, cp. 8. 62. 9 (but the accus. is found 7. 18. 9, 10).

τάδε ἴστω καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀκούσας ὑμέων: there is something of the nature of an Irish 'bull' in this imperative; but Leotychidas means *ὁ ἀκούσας*, not *ὁ μὴ ἀκούσας*, to act on the suggestion, and to pass the word.

17. **ὡυτὸς δὲ . . τοῖσι Ἕλλησι.** The passage is clumsy in expression, and particular words are scarcely correct. Stein[5] now brackets the whole as a gloss, or imitation of 8. 22 *supra*; presumably after Krueger.

18. **νόος**: cp. 7. 162 and c. 120 *infra*, notwithstanding which, the co-ordina-

Ἀρτεμισίῳ· ἢ γὰρ δὴ λαθόντα τὰ ῥήματα τοὺς βαρβάρους ἔμελλε τοὺς Ἴωνας πείσειν, ἢ ἔπειτα ἀνενειχθέντα ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους ποιήσειν ἀπίστους τοῖσι Ἕλλησι.]

Λευτυχίδεω δὲ ταῦτα ὑποθεμένου δεύτερα δὴ τάδε ἐποίευν **99**
οἱ Ἕλληνες· προσσχόντες τὰς νέας ἀπέβησαν ἐς τὸν αἰγιαλόν. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν ἐτάσσοντο, οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ὡς εἶδον τοὺς Ἕλληνας παρασκευαζομένους ἐς μάχην καὶ τοῖσι Ἴωσι παραινέσαντας, τοῦτο μὲν ὑπονοήσαντες τοὺς Σαμίους τὰ Ἑλλήνων φρονέειν ἀπαιρέονται τὰ ὅπλα. οἱ γὰρ ὦν Σάμιοι ἀπικομένων Ἀθηναίων αἰχμαλώτων ἐν τῇσι νηυσὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, τοὺς ἔλαβον ἀνὰ

20 *ἐπείτε* **B**, Koen: del. Krueger: *ἐκεῖθεν*? Stein[1 2] ‖ *ἀνενειχθέντα*: *ἀνενειχθῇ* Koen 21 *τοῖσι Ἕλλησι* secl. Abicht, Stein[2], Holder
99. 1 *λεωτυχίδεω* **α** ‖ *δὴ* om. *z* 2 *προσχόντες* RP Marc. *z* ‖ *τὰς νῆας z*: del. van H. 6 *ὦν*: *ἂν* R

tion here of **νόος τοῦ πρήγματος** or *κηρύγματος* and **ὁ Θεμιστοκλέος** (*νόος*) is a little *manqué*. So, too, **ἔπειτα ἀνενειχθέντα** as a reproduction of *ἐπείτε ἀνενειχθῇ* 8. 22 is poor, and **ἀπίστους** active, for the passive there, very suspicious. **τυγχάνει** should be *ἐτύγχανε* (Krueger). **οὗτος** might better be *τούτου*. Cp. App. Crit.; *prodit interpolatorem sermonis imperitia*, van H.

99. 1. ταῦτα ὑποθεμένου: *cum hocce consilium dedisset*, Baehr.

δεύτερα δὴ seems *de trop*, but serves to separate the action of the Hellenes from the suggestions of Leotychidas.

2. προσσχόντες τὰς νέας ἀπέβησαν ἐς τ. αἰγ. Hdt. records this remarkable operation without apparently the slightest apprehension of its military magnitude or significance. To debark on the shore in the presence of an army numerically superior (even if the *ἓξ μυριάδες* of c. 96 were not within hail), and in possession of a fortified camp, was surely a very brilliant achievement. Hdt. seems to regard it as something quite *en règle*, and keeps the Persians quietly looking on, as if they could never think of attempting to interfere. The inactivity of the Persians at this point is inexplicable except on the supposition that they despaired of the Ionians.

3. ὡς εἶδον . . παρασκευαζομένους . . παραινέσαντας: there is a double awkwardness in the sentence, the zeugma in *εἶδον*, and the hysteroproteron in the order of the participles, only partially corrected by the difference of tense. 'On seeing the Hellenes making them ready to battle (after landing), and that they had addressed an appeal to the Ionians (before landing), the Persians took two precautions.'

5. τοῦτο μέν. 'In the first place' they disarm the Samians on a suspicion of Hellenic leanings. The suspicion is indeed an old one, for it is based upon an act of the previous winter, or autumn: and does the *ὅπλων ἀπαίρεσις* only take place now, at this point, after the landing of the Greeks at Mykale? **ὑπονοέειν**: c. 88 *supra*. **τὰ Ἑλ. φρονέειν**: cp. 7. 102 *supra*.

6. οἱ γὰρ ὦν Σάμιοι κτλ. This memorable little digression records a service of the Samians to Athens, which must have taken place months before. The king's ships had reached Samos in the previous autumn, 8. 130 *supra*; the Samians had redeemed 500 Attic prisoners, and had sent them home to Athens (*ex hypothesi* reoccupied) after duly providing them for the journey, or voyage (**ἐποδιάσαντες**).

This note is somewhat startling. It presupposes an open sea between Samos and Athens. Had the 500 Athenians accompanied the Samian ambassadors in c. 90 *supra*, or preceded them? Such a pledge of good-will comes in for scant appreciation! There is doubtless some truth in the anecdote; but is it correctly chronologized? Were these Athenian prisoners liberated before the arrival of the Hellenes in Samos, c. 96 *supra*? Were they really redeemed, or had they been sold into slavery, in Samos, and liberated on the approach, or arrival of the Greek fleet?

τὴν Ἀττικὴν λελειμμένους οἱ Ξέρξεω, τούτους λυσάμενοι πάντας ἀποπέμπουσι ἐποδιάσαντες ἐς Ἀθήνας· τῶν εἵνεκεν οὐκ ἥκιστα ὑποψίην εἶχον, πεντακοσίας κεφαλὰς τῶν Ξέρξεω πολεμίων λυσάμενοι. τοῦτο δὲ τὰς διόδους τὰς ἐς τὰς κορυφὰς τῆς Μυκάλης φερούσας προστάσσουσι τοῖσι Μιλησίοισι φυλάσσειν ὡς ἐπισταμένοισι δῆθεν μάλιστα τὴν χώρην· ἐποίευν δὲ τοῦτο <τοῦδε> εἵνεκεν, ἵνα ἐκτὸς τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἔωσι. τούτους μὲν Ἰώνων, τοῖσι καὶ κατεδόκεον νεοχμὸν ἄν τι ποιέειν δυνάμιος ἐπιλαβομένοισι, τρόποισι τοιούτοισι προεφυλάσσοντο οἱ Πέρσαι, αὐτοὶ δὲ συνεφόρησαν τὰ γέρρα ἕρκος εἶναι σφίσι.

---

8 οἱ : ὑπὸ **B** 9 ἐς τὰς Sz 10 ἔχον z 11 ἐς κορυφὰς z 12 μυκάλλης S 13 ἐποίευν . . ἔωσι del. Gomperz 14 τοῦτο τοῦδε Krueger, Stein^2, Holder, van H. : τούτου 15 καὶ om. R ‖ νεωχμὸν C 17 γέρα S ‖ σφίσι Stein, Holder, van H. : σφι(ν)

---

10. **ὑποψίην εἶχον**, 'were suspected . .,' objects of suspicion; cp. *αἰτίην εἶχον* 5. 70, etc.

11. **τοῦτο δέ.** The second precaution taken by the Persians is the removal of the Milesians from the camp, on the plea that they are best qualified to guard the passes on Mykale. Precaution and plea are perplexing. The charge of the passes over Mykale interposes a suspected force between the Persians and Sardes, and the camp between that force and Miletos. Are the facts or the motives here rightly reported? If there were no Milesians in the Persian camp at Mykale, was it because the Persians had dismissed them? Or were there 'Milesians' and 'Milesians'? If the Persians entrusted to Milesians the guard of the passes, that would rather point to a confidence in their loyalty! And who are these Milesians? According to 6. 19 f. the Milesians had been annihilated and the remnant expatriated in 494 B.C., i.e. fifteen years previously; their places had been taken by Persians and Karians, the former as landlords, the latter as labourers. Was there already a new agrarian question in Miletos (cp. 5. 29)? Or is the situation of 494 B.C. grossly exaggerated? In any case it is significant of Hdt.'s methods that he betrays no misgiving on this point. Possibly when he first composed this passage he was unacquainted with the story told in 6. 19, or at least had not incorporated it in his own work—the last three Books being of earlier composition.

τὰς διόδους τὰς ἐς τὰς κορυφὰς . . φερούσας: the occupation of these passes might be for the purpose of preventing the Greeks from attacking the camp in the rear, or to obtain touch with Ephesos and the road to Sardes, in case a retreat became necessary.

Mykale (as seen from the south on a fine April morning) is a grand mountain range, culminating in twin *κορυφαί*, east and west (4130 ft. and 3966 ft. in height respectively), with a gentle slope down to the western point, where the promontory becomes involved in the outline of Samos.

15. **τοῖσι καὶ κατεδόκεον.** This dative is puzzling. The normal construction is with accus. and infinitive. Valckenaer wished to insert *ἐνεόν*. Baehr takes *δοκέειν* = *existimare*, *κατά* in comp. *contra aliquem*, the dative being constructed with verbs compounded with *κατά* (though never anywhere else with *καταδοκέειν*). Stein explains the dative as used by analogy with *συνειδέναι* (and compares *κατακρίνειν τινί τι* 2. 133, 17. 146. 6). Kuehner, *Gr. Gr.* § 568. 1, *ap.* Baehr renders: *sie glaubten* bei *ihnen, dass sie Neuerungen machten.* **νεοχμόν**: cp. c. 104. 7 *infra*, *νεοχμοῦν* 4. 201, 5. 19.

16. **δυνάμιος ἐπιλαβομένοισι**, "if occasion offered," Rawlinson; "if they found the occasion," Macaulay. *δύναμις* as 'potentiality,' possibility, is remarkable in Hdt. The participle is here conditional. With the phrase cp. *προφάσιος ἐπιλαβέσθαι* 3. 36, 6. 49; also Plato *Rep.* 360 D *εἴ τις τοιαύτης ἐξουσίας ἐπιλαβόμενος κτλ.*

Ὡς δὲ ἄρα παρεσκεύαστο τοῖσι Ἕλλησι, προσήισαν πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους· ἰοῦσι δέ σφι φήμη τε ἐσέπτατο ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον πᾶν καὶ κηρυκήιον ἐφάνη ἐπὶ τῆς κυματώγης 100

100. 1 παρεσκεύαστο Reiske, van H., Stein[3]: παρεσκευάδατο || προσίησαν BParis. 1635 z: προσίεσαν S: προσείησαν Marc. 3 κηρύκιον CP

προεφυλάσσοντο, 'took precautions against beforehand,' cp. 7. 176 *supra*; in the active more naturally of place, (νέα) τὴν προφυλάσσουσαν ἐπὶ Σκιάθῳ 8. 92 *supra*.

17. **αὐτοὶ δὲ . . σφίσι.** The exact relation of this ἕρκος of γέρρα to the ἕρκος καὶ λίθων καὶ ξύλων in c. 97 *supra* is problematical. The former is the fortified camp, from which all suspicious characters have been removed (or rendered innocuous); the 'rampart of shields' actually reappears in c. 102 *infra*; and we may suppose that here the Persians are drawn up, outside their camp, and have fixed their shields in the ground to act as a screen; but if they have advanced out beyond their fortified camp, all the more inexplicable does it appear that they should have allowed the Greeks to effect a landing without dispute, while the Greeks at their leisure landed, and drew up in battle-array, and then advanced to the attack.

On the **γέρρα** cp. c. 61 *supra*.

100. 2. **φήμη τε ἐσέπτατο . . καὶ κηρυκήιον ἐφάνη.** The *Fama* is plainly in Hdt.'s belief supernatural, as he explains; of the κηρυκήιον, a more material τεκμήριον, he takes no further account. What became of this κηρυκήιον? How many persons saw it? Was it the supernatural bearer of the supernatural message? Alas! that so much should be made of the impalpable φήμη and nothing said of the subsequent history of the ocular sign! This omission is a weak spot in the story, in the argument; and nowadays, in a world of telepathy, crystal-gazing, subliminal selves, and other scientific enchantments, which explain the φήμη to perfection, one is bound to take cognisance of the total disappearance of the material evidence.

A φήμη which Hdt. treats as in no way supernatural had run right through the medizing Greek army in Boiotia a few weeks before, cp. c. 17 *supra*; it had proved a fraud; had it turned out to be true, it might have been regarded as divine.

Diodoros 11. 35 (Ephoros), cp. Polyain. 1. 33, completely rationalizes the story of this φήμη, regarding it as a ruse by Leotychidas; Larcher and Thirlwall approve. A somewhat similar case was the fraud of Agesilaos in 394 B.C., which no doubt helped him to win the battle of Koroneia (Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 3. 10–14), when he announced the defeat of the Lakedaimonian fleet off Knidos to his army as a victory; but he had received actual despatches, and had no need to pretend a synchronism. If a few days' interval occurred between the victory in Boiotia and the victory in Ionia the φήμη is simple enough. If there was a real synchronism between the battles of Plataia and Mykale, then one of three or four alternatives can alone be true: either (*a*) the φήμη was a fraud, a ruse, a γενναῖον ψεῦδος at the moment, which afterwards proved to be true to fact; or (*b*) it was in truth supernatural, supernormal, whether you explain it by direct divine interposition or by abnormally heightened human feeling; or (*c*) thirdly, it is an element of afterthought, an embellishment of the facts, possibly traceable to excited hopes and feelings of the actual day, but without the adequate or full basis of fact asserted by the pious tradition. There is so much of this kind of thing in the story of the war that it does not appear unreasonable to ascribe the φήμη *motif*, though it rings out more precisely and positively than any other, to the same creative faculty. There was some Homeric precedent for it, though the word φήμη does not occur in the *Iliad* at all (*pace* Aischines § 141, cp. D. B. Monro, *Odyssey XIII.–XXIV.* p. 427), for the ὄσσα ἐκ Διός (*Od.* 1. 282) is its precursor. The word εἰσέπτατο occurs *Il.* 21. 494 of the flight of a bird, to which is likened the motion of a goddess (Artemis).

κείμενον· ἡ δὲ φήμη διῆλθέ σφι ὧδε, ὡς οἱ Ἕλληνες τὴν Μαρδονίου στρατιὴν νικῷεν ἐν Βοιωτοῖσι μαχόμενοι. δῆλα δὴ πολλοῖσι τεκμηρίοισι ἐστὶ τὰ θεῖα τῶν πρηγμάτων, εἰ καὶ τότε, τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρης συμπιπτούσης τοῦ τε ἐν Πλαταιῇσι καὶ τοῦ ἐν Μυκάλῃ μέλλοντος ἔσεσθαι τρώματος, φήμη τοῖσι Ἕλλησι τοῖσι ταύτῃ ἐσαπίκετο, ὥστε θαρσῆσαί τε τὴν στρατιὴν πολλῷ μᾶλλον καὶ ἐθέλειν προθυμότερον κινδυνεύειν.

101 *καὶ τόδε ἕτερον συνέπεσε γενόμενον, Δήμητρος τεμένεα Ἐλευσινίης παρὰ ἀμφοτέρας τὰς συμβολὰς εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ δὴ ἐν*

---

4 ὦιδε CP : ἤδε? Krueger 5 δὲ **β** 7 αὐτῆς del. Krueger || συμπίπτοντος Reiske, van H., Stein[3] || τε : τ' R(S)V || πλαταίῃισι **α** : πλαταίῃσι R(S)V 8 μυκάλλῃ S || φήμη δὲ **β** 9 τοῖσι om. Marc. **101.** 2 παρὰ : 'expectes παρὰ Δήμητρος κτέ? van H. : πάρα Dobree

---

4. **ἡ δὲ φ. διῆλθέ σφι ὧδε**: sc. *τὸ στρατόπεδον*. The exact terms of the *φήμη* are very nearly identical with the message (*ἀγγελίη*) which had reached the Greeks at the Heraion in front of Plataia that same day, *ὅτι μάχῃ τε γέγονε καὶ νικῷεν οἱ μετὰ Παυσανίεω* c. 69 *supra*. The imperf. pres. *νικῷεν* here of the *fait accompli* (cp. *γεγονέναι νίκην* c. 101 *infra*) is remarkable; Xenoph. *Hell.* 4. 3. 1 has *νικῷεν* (but 4. 3. 10 *ὅτι ἡττημένοι εἶεν*); Stein compares *νικᾶν* in c. 48 *supra*, and interprets 'are victors' (*Sieger seien*). The use of *νικᾶν* there absolutely is easier than *νικῷεν* here with a direct object. Might it be one of Hdt.'s imperfects, of an action the result of which is abiding, or continuous? The passage in Xenophon shows that we need not read *νενικῷεν* here. **ἐν Βοιωτοῖσι** is purely geographical.

5. **δῆλα δὴ . . τὰ θεῖα τῶν πρηγμάτων**: "many things prove to me that the gods take part in the affairs of men," Rawlinson; "now by many signs is the divine power seen in earthly things," Macaulay. But the passage involves a classification of 'things,' into *τὰ θεῖα* and *τὰ μὴ θεῖα*, rather than the general assertion of the existence of "a divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will." Cp. c. 65 *supra*. Hdt. is here a 'dualist': far from the formula of Thales, *πάντα πλήρη θεῶν*, but close to 'common sense,' or 'popular philosophy,' as we know it. Hdt.'s argument is not very closely expressed; the particular instance (*εἰ καὶ τότε*) cannot prove the general (*πολλοῖσι τεκμηρίοισι*). But the formal statement here is not the real statement. The true predicate lies in *τὰ θεῖα*: what is plain, by many infallible proofs, among them *par exemple* the particular case quoted, is the fact that some things are *θεῖα*, that 'miracles do happen'—though, of course, most happenings are quite ordinary and natural. (There are even degrees in the class, cp. 7. 137 *τοῦτό μοι ἐν τοῖσι θειότατον φαίνεται γενέσθαι*, 8. 65 *θεῖον τὸ φθεγγόμενον*, 8. 94 *θεῖον τὸ πρῆγμα*.) Cp. Introduction, § 11.

7. **τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρης συμπιπτούσης**: the expression is somewhat clumsy—a day cannot coincide with itself—but the meaning is plain: the day, or date, of the action at Plataia and the date of the action just about to take place at Mykale was identically the same; but it was 'the actions,' not 'the day,' which coincided. *συμπίπτοντος* or *συμπιπτόντων* would certainly be clearer (cp. App. Crit.): but is Hdt. always quite clear in thought or expression? **τρῶμα**: cp. c. 90 *supra*. **ταύτῃ**: sc. *ἐν Μυκάλῃ*.

101. 1. **τόδε ἕτερον συνέπεσε γενόμενον**, 'a second coincidence occurred as follows.' The expression again is not quite accurate: it takes two items to make a coincidence, and only one item is here expressed. Again, the coincident 'occurrences' are the 'existence' of two shrines of Demeter, one at Plataia and one at Mykale; but, strictly speaking, the existence of the shrines is not the occurrence, but rather the battles by the shrines.

2. **συμβολάς**, of 'hostile meeting,' as in 4. 159, 6. 120, 7. 210, etc.

τῇ Πλαταιίδι παρ᾽ αὐτὸ τὸ Δημήτριον ἐγίνετο, ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται, ἡ μάχη, καὶ ἐν Μυκάλῃ ἔμελλε ὡσαύτως ἔσεσθαι. γεγονέναι δὲ νίκην τῶν μετὰ Παυσανίεω Ἑλλήνων ὀρθῶς σφι ἡ φήμη συνέβαινε ἐλθοῦσα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐν Πλαταιῇσι <τρῶμα> πρωὶ ἔτι τῆς ἡμέρης ἐγίνετο, τὸ δὲ ἐν Μυκάλῃ περὶ δείλην. ὅτι δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρης συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι μηνός τε τοῦ αὐτοῦ, χρόνῳ οὐ πολλῷ σφι ὕστερον δῆλα ἀναμανθάνουσι ἐγίνετο. ἦν δὲ ἀρρωδίη σφι, πρὶν τὴν φήμην ἐσαπικέσθαι, οὔτι περὶ σφέων αὐτῶν οὕτω ὡς τῶν

3 ἐγένετο P Marc. : οὗ ἐγένετο z 4 εἴρητο P || μυκάλλῃ S || ἔσεσθαι ὡσαύτως **B** 7 πλαταίῃ **B** || <τρῶμα> Stein⁽²⁾ ³, van H. 8 μυκάλλῃ S 9 μηνός τε τοῦ αὐτοῦ suspecta habeo 10 πρινὴ R(S)V : πρὶν ἢ Holder, van H. 11 αὐτέων z || τῶν Ἑλλήνων : τῶν ἐκεῖ Ἑλλήνων coni. Stein[1] : τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων Krueger, Stein⁽²⁾, van H.

3. **ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται** : a definite cross-reference back to cc. 57, 62, 65 *supra*.

5. **γεγονέναι δὲ νίκην** : this appears as equivalent to *νικῷεν* c. 100 *supra* ; cp. also c. 69 *supra*.

6. **ὀρθῶς σφι ἡ φήμη συνέβαινε ἐλθοῦσα**, 'the rumour which (had) reached them turned out to be true,' or 'they discovered the truth of the rumour which had reached them.' The exact force of *συνέβαινε* here is disputable : its repetition just below, and in a slightly different sense, is by no means un-Herodotean.

7. **πρωὶ ἔτι τῆς ἡμέρης.** The adv. *πρωί* is not found elsewhere in Hdt. Homer (*Il.* 8. 530 etc.), Xenophon (*Hell.* 1. 1. 30 *ἑκάστης ἡμέρας πρῲ καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέραν*) and other good writers use it = *mane*, explained by Theophrastos *Fr.* 6. 1. 9 as the forenoon, from *ἀνατολή* to *μεσημβρία*. But it is also used more generally, cp. Thuc. 4. 6. 1, etc. *ἔτι* is not = *ἤδη* but used with comparative force.

8. **περὶ δείλην**, 'about evening,' cp. 8. 6, 9, a passage which proves that the term admits of degrees. Here, in opposition to *πρωί*, it may mean merely p.m.

ὅτι δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρης συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι. Hdt.'s predication again is not quite clear. The grammatical subject of *συνέβαινε* may be *τὸ ἐν Μυκάλῃ* (sc. *τρῶμα*), or the two (sc. *ἀμφότερα*, or *τὰ τρώματα*), *δῆλα* perhaps favouring this view : *συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι* is, however, a simple and constant form for an occurrence, or event, taking place.

9. **μηνός τε τοῦ αὐτοῦ** is a very frigid addition. Or would Hdt., then, have regarded it as possible for two events to take place on the same day in different months? But it is a thousand pities that he did not happen to give us the Attic date, by month, and day of the month, for the victory. If it had taken place in Boëdromion, and about the time of the Eleusinia, would not tradition have more clearly emphasized the festive date?

The actual and precise day is given by Plutarch *Aristeid.* 19 as Boëdromion 4 = Panemos 27, but in *Camillus* 19 and *Mor.* 349 F as Boëdromion 3 < = Panemos 26 >, a curious discrepancy. In any case the date may be that of the *Charisteria*, not of the battle. Hdt.'s data do not enable us to fix the date of the final battle at Plataia with precision. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* ii.[2] (1895) 726, 742, places Plataia 'at the beginning of August,' and Mykale 'about the middle of August,' denying the synchronism. I should be inclined to admit the synchronism, or an approximate synchronism, and to place the battles somewhat later, early in September ; cp. Appendix VII. § 6, VIII. § 2 (i.). The fact that other striking synchronisms are less trustworthy, cp. 7. 166 *supra*, does not entirely discredit this one. What is damaging to Hdt.'s credit as historian is the insistence on the synchronism, as a mere wonder, to the complete exclusion of its significance from a strategic point of view.

11. **οὔτι περὶ σφέων αὐτῶν** : this generous self-oblivion might at least attest the sense that strategically the

Ἑλλήνων, μὴ περὶ Μαρδονίῳ πταίσῃ ἡ Ἑλλάς. ὡς μέντοι ἡ κληδὼν αὕτη σφι ἐσέπτατο, μᾶλλόν τι καὶ ταχύτερον τὴν πρόσοδον ἐποιεῦντο. οἱ μὲν δὴ Ἕλληνες καὶ οἱ βάρβαροι ἔσπευδον ἐς τὴν μάχην, ὥς σφι καὶ αἱ νῆσοι καὶ ὁ Ἑλλήσποντος ἄεθλα προέκειτο.

102 *Τοῖσι μέν νυν Ἀθηναίοισι καὶ τοῖσι προσεχέσι τούτοισι τεταγμένοισι, μέχρι κου τῶν ἡμισέων, ἡ ὁδὸς ἐγίνετο κατ᾽ αἰγιαλόν τε καὶ ἄπεδον χῶρον, τοῖσι δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοισι καὶ τοῖσι ἐπεξῆς τούτοισι τεταγμένοισι κατά τε χαράδραν καὶ ὄρεα. ἐν ᾧ δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι περιήισαν, οὗτοι οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ*

---

13 *κληδὼν* z: *κλεηδὼν* Merzdorf || *σφι*: *τοι* Marc. || *τι*: *τοι* Marc. 14 Cf. comment. infra **102.** 2 *κου*: *κατὰ* Paris. 1635 z || *ἡμισέων* Cz: *ἡμίσεων* || *ἡ* om. CS 3 *δὲ* om. C 4 *χαράνδραν* C: *χαράδρην* Pz 5 *οὔρεα* CP Marc. z, van H.

---

decisive blow in this campaign could not be struck by the fleet, nor could a check, or even a disaster to the fleet, matter so much. *περί* is used with the genitive similarly 8. 36 *σφέων αὐτῶν πέρι ἐφρόντιζον*. For **ἀρρωδίῃ** cp. *ibid.*

τῶν Ἑλλήνων, 'the Greeks at home'—**ἡ Ἑλλάς** includes themselves.

12. **μὴ περὶ Μαρδονίῳ πταίσῃ ἡ Ἑλλάς**: with the dative *περί* has primarily a locative force, and does not lose it even when locality ceases to be the prominent interest; the metaphor here (*πταίσῃ*) may be of shipwreck, but *πρός* is the preposition more generally in use. Cp. Plato, *Rep.* 553 B *ἔπειτα αὐτὸν ἴδῃ ἐξαίφνης πταίσαντα ὥσπερ πρὸς ἕρματι πρὸς τῇ πόλει.* The wrecking of Hellas on Mardonios might have been accomplished by battle, or by bribery, cp. c. 2 *supra*.

13. **ἡ κληδών**: cp. c. 91 *supra*; here the word = *ἡ φήμη*, cp. c. 100 *supra*.

ταχύτερον: *θᾶσσον* is not found in Hdt., nor *ταχύτατα*.

τὴν πρόσοδον, of a hostile advance, advance to the attack, as in 7. 223 (differently 6. 46). There is predicative force in the position of **αὕτη**.

14. **καὶ οἱ βάρβαροι ἔσπευδον**: this assertion is of something quite new; hitherto the barbarians have not been anxious to fight. Now, however, they have drawn the Greeks to land, they have a fortified camp behind them, they have a *corps d'armée* somewhere about, if c. 96 *supra* is to be trusted, and they have apparently advanced and fixed their *γέρρα* as a *ἕρκος* before them (c. 99 *supra*); they still remained on the defensive though eager for the fray. Is the text here correct? Nothing corresponds to **οἱ μὲν δὴ Ἕλληνες**—*οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι* with a contrasted verb to *ἔσπευδον* might originally have concluded the chapter.

15. **ὥς σφι καὶ αἱ νῆσοι καὶ ὁ Ἑλλήσποντος ἄεθλα προέκειτο**, 'inasmuch as (seeing that) the islands and the Hellespont were the prizes at stake for them.' *ὡς . . προέκειτο* is remarkable: *ὡς = ἐπεί* (one might have expected *ὡς* with participle, gen. abs.).

The Greeks and Persians at Mykale could hardly have taken this view of the case unless they had been already acquainted with the defeat of Mardonios. Were the Persians equally informed, by the *φήμη*, or by an *ἀγγελίη* from Leotychidas, which, of course, they would not have believed; or, in fact, had sufficient time elapsed for the news to have reached Sardes as well as Samos? The islands would be those in proximity to Asia: the Kyklades were already free.

102. 1. **προσεχέσι**: for the word cp. c. 28 *supra*. The construction here with *τεταγμένοισι* is quasi-adverbial; cp. *ἐπεξῆς τεταγμένοι infra*; the Korinthians, Sikyonians and Troizenians are intended, but the names are here withheld; they, with the Athenians, formed the left half, or flank, of the army. As they walk over the lower ground it seems that the Greeks have landed east of the Persian encampment.

5. **ἐν ᾧ**: sc. *χρόνῳ*. *ἔτι* is perhaps a corruption, or remainder of a lost word

ἑτέρῳ κέρεϊ [ἔτι] καὶ δὴ ἐμάχοντο. ἕως μέν νυν τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ὀρθὰ ἦν τὰ γέρρα, ἠμύνοντό τε καὶ οὐδὲν ἔλασσον εἶχον τῇ μάχῃ· ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν προσεχέων ὁ στρατός, ὅκως ἑωυτῶν γένηται τὸ ἔργον καὶ μὴ Λακεδαιμονίων, παρακελευσάμενοι ἔργου εἴχοντο προθυμότερον, ἐνθεῦτεν ἤδη ἑτεροιοῦτο τὸ πρῆγμα. διωσάμενοι γὰρ τὰ γέρρα οὕτω φερόμενοι ἐσέπεσον ἀλέες ἐς τοὺς Πέρσας, οἱ δὲ δεξάμενοι καὶ χρόνον συχνὸν ἀμυνόμενοι τέλος ἔφευγον ἐς τὸ τεῖχος. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ καὶ Κορίνθιοι καὶ Σικυώνιοι καὶ Τροιζήνιοι (οὗτοι γὰρ ἦσαν ἐπεξῆς τεταγμένοι) συνεπισπόμενοι συνεσέ-

6 *κεραϊ* **B**z || *ἔτι* del. Schaefer, Stein², Holder: ante *περιήισαν* retrax. Steger, van H.: an *ἔτυχον προτερέοντες καὶ δή*? 7 *ὀρθὰ* Stein², Holder, van H.: *ὄρθρια* S: *ὄρθια* || *γέρα* S || *οἱ δ' ἠμύνοντο*? Krueger 8 *ἐπεί τε δὲ* S || *τῶν* ante *προσεχέων* om. S 9 *γένοιτο* z 11 *γὰρ*: *δὲ* **B** || *γέρα* S || *οὕτω* Naber, Gomperz, Holder, Stein³: *οὗτοι* 12 *ἐπέπεσον* Marc. || *αλέες* A: *ἀλέες* B || *καὶ* om. C 13 *ἀμυνάμενοι* van H. 15 *οὗτοι* **B**, Holder, Stein³: *οὕτω* || *ἔσαν* z || *οἱ ἐπεξῆς* **B** || *ἐπισπόμενοι* Cobet, van H. || *συνέπιπτον* **B**

(*ἐτιμωρέοντο*, or *ἔτυχον προτερέοντες*). Stein takes *καὶ δή* as it stands to be = *ἤδη*.

6. **ἕως . . τὰ γέρρα**: the shields have been erected in c. 99 *ad f.*

7. **οὐδὲν ἔλασσον εἶχον**: cp. c. 70 *supra* (*πλέον εἶχον*). Only Persians appear engaged.

8. **τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν προσεχέων ὁ στρατός**: treated as quite a distinct and separate unit, or rather army, or *corps d'armée*; the names are still withheld.

9. **ὅκως ἑωυτῶν . . καὶ μὴ Λακεδαιμονίων**: the negative *μή* shows that this is given as in the minds of the Athenians; it is, indeed, a genuine *motif* of Athenian legend and oratory, and in the hands of Isokrates (cp. *Hdt. IV.–VI.* ii. 194 f.) became a guide to the reconstruction of the past. It betrays, or suggests, the character of the source from which Hdt. has drawn the story of Mykale: Athenian, or phil-Athenian.

10. **παρακελευσάμενοι**, 'encouraging each other with shouts,' cp. 8. 15. **ἔργου εἴχοντο**, cp. 8. 11 *supra*.

ἤδη, 'at once.'

11. **ἑτεροιοῦτο τὸ πρῆγμα**, 'the affair took a fresh turn, aspect'; cp. 7. 225 *supra*.

διωσάμενοι γὰρ τὰ γέρρα: this phrase marks the second stage in the struggle; they pushed their way through the rampart of Persian shields—or pushed the shields apart, so as to open a way for themselves—and then charged (**φερόμενοι**) *en masse* (**ἀλέες**) on the Persians behind the shields, who had doubtless been plying them with arrows. *διωθέεσθαι* in a more general sense, c. 88 *supra*.

12. **οἱ δέ**: the *δέ* is demonstrative, or emphatic; the sentence might otherwise have been relative.

13. **χρόνον συχνὸν ἀμυνόμενοι τέλος ἔφευγον** = *χρ. σ. ἠμύνοντο τέλος δὲ ἔφευγον*. A rather lax use of the present, or imperfect, participle.

14. **Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ καὶ Κορίνθιοι καὶ Σικυώνιοι καὶ Τροιζήνιοι**: at last, when the victory is won, the other contingents on the left wing are expressly named, besides the Athenians.

15. **ἦσαν . . τεταγμένοι**: how little this construction is a mere temporal pluperfect appears from this passage; they were, what they had been all along, ranged *ἐπεξῆς Ἀθηναίοισι*, in the given order (*οὕτω*).

συνεπισπόμενοι συνεσέπιπτον: they entered the fortified camp *en masse* (i.e. without breaking from one another), and at the same time as the Persians, whom they were pursuing, i.e. pursuers and pursued all entered together. *συνεσέπιπτον*, by the way, throws some light

πιπτον ἐς τὸ τεῖχος. ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἀραίρητο, οὔτ' ἔτι πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο οἱ βάρβαροι πρὸς φυγήν τε ὁρμέατο οἱ ἄλλοι πλὴν Περσέων· οὗτοι δὲ κατ' ὀλίγους γινόμενοι ἐμάχοντο τοῖσι αἰεὶ ἐς τὸ τεῖχος ἐσπίπτουσι Ἑλλήνων. καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν τῶν Περσικῶν δύο μὲν ἀποφεύγουσι, δύο δὲ τελευτῶσι· Ἀρταΰντης μὲν καὶ Ἰθαμίτρης τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατηγέοντες ἀποφεύγουσι, Μαρδόντης δὲ καὶ ὁ τοῦ πεζοῦ
103 στρατηγὸς Τιγράνης μαχόμενοι τελευτῶσι. ἔτι δὲ μαχομένων τῶν Περσέων ἀπίκοντο Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ συνδιεχείριζον. ἔπεσον δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν Ἑλλήνων συχνοὶ ἐνθαῦτα ἄλλοι τε καὶ Σικυώνιοι καὶ στρατηγὸς Περίλεως.

---

16 καὶ om. Paris. 1635 z || οὔτέ τι P Marc.: οὔτε τι z 17 καὶ πρὸς ante ἀλκὴν R (ap. Stein[1]) || καὶ πρὸς ante φυγὴν **B** (ap. Holder) || ὡρμέατο P Marc. 18 κατ' ὀλίγον S: κατὰ λόγους B 21 Ἰθραμίτρης z 103. 2, 3 αὐτέων (bis) z 3 τῶν om. RSV 4 Σικυώνιοι καὶ: Σικυωνίων coni. Stein, adsc. van H. || περίλεος **B**z

---

upon its correlate συνεξέπιπτον as in 5. 22.

16. **ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἀραίρητο** marks the third stage in the combat, or rather its culmination. The pluperfect is hardly temporal, for the fighting is not yet all over. πρὸς ἀλκὴν τρέπεσθαι (cp. ἀλκῆς μεμνῆσθαι c. 70 *supra*) is just the opposite of ἐς φυγὴν τρέπεσθαι, cp. c. 63 *supra*, 8. 91, etc.

17. **οἱ βάρβαροι**: did no Greeks strike a blow on this occasion upon the Persian side? Cp. c. 103. 8 *infra*.

πρὸς φυγήν τε ὁρμέατο: so in Thuc. 4. 14. 1 τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐς φυγὴν ὡρμημένων, of actual or literal physical movement.

18. **κατ' ὀλίγους γινόμενοι**, "forming into small knots," Blakesley; the preposition has distributive force, cp. 8. 113 *supra* ἐξελέγετο κατ' ὀλίγους.

19. **τοῖσι αἰεὶ . . ἐσπίπτουσι** might seem hardly consistent with συνεπισπόμενοι συνεσέπιπτον above (the imperfect notwithstanding); but that phrase was obviously rhetorical, this is both more accurate and more 'elegant.'

21. **Ἀρταΰντης**: cp. 8. 130 *supra*, c. 107 *infra*.

Ἰθαμίτρης: cp. 8. 130 *supra*.

22. **Μαρδόντης**: cp. 8. 130 *supra*; his fate suggests that he was especially in command of the Persian *Epibatai*.

23. **Τιγράνης**: cp. c. 96 *supra*. His death is really the first clear intimation in the story of the actual presence at Mykale of any of the six myriads, of which he is there put in command: is it sufficient to convince us that any part of the *corps d'armée* was present, or engaged in the battle, or that the battle was more than an engagement between the Greek forces, from the fleet, and the Medo-Persian *Epibatai* from the king's fleet—the only portion of the navy, probably, which could be trusted to show fight, especially on land? Athenian or phil-Attic tradition has exaggerated the battle of Mykale into a grand piece to match the synchronous battle in Boiotia; cp. c. 106 *infra*. Tigranes, if killed on this occasion, was perhaps in command of the Persian *Epibatai*; cp. c. 96 *supra*.

103. 1. **ἔτι δέ.** It is only at the fourth stage of the fight that the Lakedaimonians and their half of the army arrive on the scene, and help to finish the remnant (**τὰ λοιπὰ συνδιεχείριζον**). Hdt. does not employ the simpler forms χειρίζειν or διαχειρίζειν, nor any one else the double compound.

4. **συχνός** = πολλός, πολύς: cp. c. 102 *supra*, *et passim*.

Περίλεως: the name Perilaos was common and widespread; i.e. there is nothing specially Sikyonian, or even Peloponnesian about it. (Cp. Pape-Benseler, *sub v.*) Nothing more is recorded of this man: the absence of a patronymic suggests that Hdt. did not get this item from an inscription, least

τῶν τε Σαμίων οἱ στρατευόμενοι ἐόντες τε ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τῷ Μηδικῷ καὶ ἀπαραιρημένοι τὰ ὅπλα, ὡς εἶδον αὐτίκα κατ' ἀρχὰς γινομένην ἑτεραλκέα τὴν μάχην, ἔρδον ὅσον ἐδυνέατο προσωφελέειν ἐθέλοντες τοῖσι Ἕλλησι. Σαμίους δὲ ἰδόντες οἱ ἄλλοι Ἴωνες ἄρξαντας οὕτω δὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀποστάντες ἀπὸ Περσέων ἐπέθεντο τοῖσι βαρβάροισι. Μιλησίοισι δὲ προσε- **104**
τέτακτο μὲν <ἐκ> τῶν Περσέων τὰς διόδους τηρέειν σωτηρίης

---

5 *τε*: *δὲ* **ß**, Holder, van H. || *συστρατευόμενοι* Cobet, van H. || *ἐνεόντες* Ask. || *τε* om. R*z* 6 *καταρχὰς* ABP*z* 7 *ὑπεραλκέα* **ß** || *ἔρδον* P, Stein, Holder: *ἑρδον* AB: *ἕρδον* || *ἠδυνέατο* SV(Gaisf.) **104.** 1 *μιλήσιοι* SR: *μηλίσιοι* V 2 *μὲν* om. **ß** || *ἐκ* suppl. Valckenaer, Stein[2], van H.: *πρὸς* Cobet, Holder || *τηρεῖν* libri, Holder, van H.: corr. Stein

---

of all in Sikyon. Samian or Athenian tradition may have preserved the bare name of the only general who fell on this occasion.

5. **τῶν τε Σαμίων**: this great, though somewhat vague, service of the Samians is very lightly and easily introduced; in fact Hdt. has nothing concrete or definite to report on their behalf. **οἱ στρατευόμενοι**, cp. 7. 61 *supra*. **ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ**, not necessarily *ἐν τῷ τείχει*, cp. c. 15 *supra*. But what of the Samians on the Greek side, of whom there should now have been some? Or were there as yet no Samians serving? Cp. c. 92 *supra*.

6. **ἀπαραιρημένοι τὰ ὅπλα**, 'deprived of their heavy arms,' cp. c. 99 *supra*. *ἀπαιρέειν* takes double acc., cp. 8. 3 *supra*.

αὐτίκα κατ' ἀρχάς: cp. 7. 88 *supra*; it would go better here with *ἔρδον*.

7. **ἑτεραλκέα**: cp. 8. 11 *supra*.

ἔρδον ὅσον ἐδυνέατο: the first verb is rather epic (cp. 7. 33 *supra*). What did they 'do'? They might have set fire to the camp? or they might have pulled it partially to pieces; or they might have 'done sacrifice': but this testimonial lacks precision.

8. **προσωφελέειν** with the dative Stein regards as 'poetical'; it is used with the acc. c. 68 *supra* in a more precise or definite context.

οἱ ἄλλοι Ἴωνες: not including the Milesians, as the next c. shows. There were thus Ionians besides the Samians and the Milesians serving with the Persians; they would be the crews of the ships.

9. **ἄρξαντας**: i.e. *αὐτίκα κατ' ἀρχὰς ἔρδοντας ὅσον ἐδυνέατο.*

ἀποστάντες ἀπὸ Περσέων: this phrase is hardly to be taken in the physical sense, suggested by the immediate context, viz. stood off, separated from the Persians there and then, but rather in the political sense: threw off their allegiance to Persia. The absence of the article and the last sentence of the next c. support this view. Cp. c. 90 *supra*.

10. **ἐπέθεντο τοῖσι βαρβάροισι.** This attack on the barbarians goes beyond anything explicitly recorded of the Samians in the context, but it still leaves something to be desired, in the way of concrete definiteness. Rawlinson *ad l.* remarks that "Hdt. is never very favourable to the Ionian Greeks and may have given them on this occasion less credit than they deserved." *Euge!* Diodoros (Ephoros) is kinder; cp. Appendix VII. § 7 (*c*), 2. Had Hdt. written the story of Mykale before his visit to Samos, where the fame of that island grew dearer to him (cp. 3. 60)? And did he leave what he had written unrevised?

104. 1. **Μιλησίοισι δὲ προσετέτακτο**: the pluperfect is in strict time; cp. c. 99 *supra*; but the two reasons already given, and here more explicitly repeated, are inconsistent with each other. If the Persians removed the Milesians to prevent their creating a disturbance, a mutiny, or at least some trouble in the camp, they distrusted their loyalty. If they distrusted their loyalty, they did not entrust to them the custody of the passes, or expect them to act as their

εἵνεκά σφι, ὡς, ἢν ἄρα σφέας καταλαμβάνῃ οἷά περ κατέλαβε, ἔχοντες ἡγεμόνας σῴζωνται ἐς τὰς κορυφὰς τῆς Μυκάλης. ἐτάχθησαν μέν νυν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τὸ πρῆγμα οἱ Μιλήσιοι τούτου τε εἵνεκεν καὶ ἵνα μὴ παρεόντες τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τι νεοχμὸν ποιέοιεν· οἳ δὲ πᾶν τοὐναντίον τοῦ προστεταγμένου ἐποίεον, ἄλλας τε κατηγεόμενοί σφι ὁδοὺς φεύγουσι, αἳ δὴ ἔφερον ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους, καὶ τέλος αὐτοί σφι ἐγίνοντο [κτείνοντες] πολεμιώτατοι. οὕτω δὴ τὸ δεύτερον Ἰωνίη ἀπὸ Περσέων ἀπέστη.

105 *Ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ Ἑλλήνων ἠρίστευσαν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ἀθηναίων Ἑρμόλυκος ὁ Εὐθοίνου ἀνὴρ παγκράτιον*

---

3 ἆρά AB 4 σῴζωνται van H., Stein[3]: σώιζονται C: σώζωνται **α**, Stein[1 2], Holder: σώζονται **β**Ppr. Marc. z || (μυκάλλης S ?) 6 τε: γε **α**: om. **β** || εἵνεκα Marc.z || ἐν τῷ **β**, Holder, van H. 7 τὸ ἐναντίον **β** 8 δὴ ἔφερον z: διέφερον 9 αὐτοῖς R || κτείνοντες del. Gomperz, Holder, van H., Stein[3] 10 ἰωνίη τὸ δεύτερον **β** (τοδεύτερον S) **105.** 1 ἀρίστευσαν Marc. 2 εὐθοίνου CPz: εὐθόνου **α**: εὐθύνου **β**, Valla, Gaisford

---

guides to safe places of retreat, in case of a disaster occurring, such as actually occurred.

3. **ἄρα** here, as frequently, may be taken to suggest the unexpected. The historian speaks *propria persona* in οἷά περ κατέλαβε: ἢν καταλαμβάνῃ being of course future in force. **νεοχμόν** (l. 6) is repeated from c. 99.

7. **οἳ δέ**: the demonstrative (article), with δέ, resumes the subject of the sentence, and so lends it additional emphasis. Cp. note to 7. 51. 3, etc.

8. **αἳ δή**: the relative, emphasized.

ἔφερον ἐς, 'led into,' among; φέρειν ἐς in metaph. sense c. 33 *supra*. But cp. App. Crit.

10. **τὸ δεύτερον Ἰωνίη ἀπὸ Περσέων ἀπέστη**, 'Ionia threw off the Persian yoke for the second time.' (Cp. cc. 103, 90 *supra*.) This statement involves an implicit reference to the first or former revolt, and so might seem to take the record given in Bk. 5 for granted. But the fact of that revolt was no doubt notorious; Hdt. might even have found the revolt of 479 B.C. already noted as the δευτέρη ἀπόστασις, and it is not even necessary to suppose this little sentence (or the words τὸ δεύτερον) a gloss, or an insertion of the second draft by the author, in order to reconcile it with the theory of the prior composition of Bks. 7–9. Cp. Introduction, §§ 7, 8.

105. 1. **ἠρίστευσαν Ἀθηναῖοι**, 'the Athenians obtained the meed of valour.' Cp. 8. 17 *supra* for the formula.

2. **Ἑρμόλυκος ὁ Εὐθοίνου.** The father's name is corrupt in the best MSS.; cp. App. Crit. εὐθύνου looks like a correction of εὐθόνου. Euthynos is a commoner name at Athens than 'Euthoinos,' which is, however, found on Inscripp. 'Hermolykos' is mentioned again as pankratiast with a statue on the Akropolis (Pausan. 1. 23. 10). Whether this Hermolykos son of Euthoinos was any relation to Hermolykos son of Diitrephes, who dedicated a statue of his father (cp. Pausanias 1. 23. 3), apparently the general Diitrephes well known from Thucydides (7. 29. 1, 8. 64. 1), is a much debated question; cp. Frazer, *Pausanias* ii. 275 f., 289; Hitzig-Bluemner, *Pausanias* (1896), notes *ad ll.c.*

παγκράτιον ἐπασκήσας, 'who (had) practised (successfully? ἐπι-) as a pankratiast.' The *pankration*, a combination of boxing (πυγμή) and wrestling (πάλη), was first introduced at Olympia in 648 B.C., Ol. 33, Pausan. 5. 8. 8; cp. Clinton, *Fasti* i. p. 198; and victories in the pankration are celebrated in several of Pindar's *Epinikia*: e.g. *Nem.* 2, 3, 5, *Isth.* 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

ἐπασκήσας. τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Ἑρμόλυκον κατέλαβε ὕστερον τούτων, πολέμου ἐόντος Ἀθηναίοισί τε καὶ Καρυστίοισι, ἐν Κύρνῳ τῆς Καρυστίης χώρης ἀποθανόντα ἐν μάχῃ κεῖσθαι ἐπὶ Γεραιστῷ. μετὰ δὲ Ἀθηναίους Κορίνθιοι καὶ Τροιζήνιοι καὶ Σικυώνιοι ἠρίστευσαν.

Ἐπείτε δὲ κατεργάσαντο οἱ Ἕλληνες τοὺς πολλοὺς τοὺς **106** *μὲν μαχομένους τοὺς δὲ καὶ φεύγοντας τῶν βαρβάρων, τάς <τε> νέας ἐνέπρησαν καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἅπαν, τὴν ληίην προεξαγαγόντες ἐς τὸν αἰγιαλόν, καὶ θησαυρούς τινας χρημάτων εὗρον· ἐμπρήσαντες δὲ τὸ τεῖχος καὶ τὰς νέας ἀπέπλεον. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἐς Σάμον οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐβουλεύοντο περὶ ανα-*

---

4 *τουτέων* z 6 *γεραίστω* R(S)V **106.** 2, 3 *τάς <τε>* van H., Stein[3]: *τὰς* 3, 5 *νῆας* (bis) z 4 *καὶ <γὰρ>* van H. 5 *τό <τε>* van H. || *ἀπέπλωον* idem 6 *περὶ τῆς* Marc. || *ἀναστάσεος* z

---

3. **κατέλαβε ὕστερον τούτων**: for the verb cp. cc. 93, 104 *supra*, 'overtook.' The general date places the event in the *Pentekontaëteris*, but unfortunately without a precise year. The war between 'the Athenians' and the Karystians is, however, presumably that one commemorated by Thuc. 1. 98. 3 about 472 B.C.; cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* iii. (1897) 140.

4. **ἐν Κύρνῳ**: this Kyrnos in Euboia, in the territory of Karystos, is not elsewhere mentioned. The nominal coincidence with the island Corsica (cp. 7. 165 *supra*) was not perhaps accidental. On Karystos cp. 8. 121 *supra*. On Geraistos, 8. 7 *supra*.

6. **Κορίνθιοι . . Τροιζήνιοι . . Σικυώνιοι**: the order of merit differs slightly from their order in battle-array c. 102 *supra*, but all contingents on the left wing obtained prizes. The right (Lakedaimonians, etc.) was quite left in the shade. This story is hardly of Spartan origin.

106. 1. **ἐπείτε . . κατεργάσαντο**, *cum interfecissent* (Baehr). They seem to have taken no prisoners on this occasion.

3. **τὴν ληίην προεξαγαγόντες**, 'though not until they (had) brought (led) out the spoil.' It was apparently alive, at least some of it. Thuc. 2. 94. 3 *ἀνθρώπους καὶ λείαν λαβόντες.*

4. **καὶ θησαυρούς . . εὗρον** is not in strict construction. Stein regards it as an addition from the author's hand; cp. Introduction, § 9. **χρήματα** apparently = money, but might cover plate.

5. **ἀπέπλεον.** Obviously the Greek forces at Mykale had not defeated, had not even encountered, the *corps d'armée* accredited to Tigranes c. 96 *supra*; had they done so, the road to Sardes was once more open to them. The battle of Mykale was evidently a *πρόσκρουσμα βραχὺ τοῖς βαρβάροις*, a raid, a brilliant raid no doubt, but not a great victory, and the Greeks at once retired, before the Persian land-forces came up, and abandoned the mainland to its fate.

6. **περὶ ἀναστάσιος τῆς Ἰωνίης.** At Samos, after their return from Mykale, the Hellenes, i.e. the naval *Synedrion*, cp. c. 90 *supra*, discussed the question of 'the evacuation of Ionia.' This was an old idea, started by Bias of Priene, if 1. 170 may be trusted; some of the Ionians (in 546 B.C.) *τὴν δουλοσύνην οὐκ ἀνεχόμενοι ἐξέλιπον τὰς πατρίδας* (1. 169). Again in 494 B.C. a few voluntarily (6. 17) and still more against their will (6. 20) had left their homes for ever. A migration *en masse* had recently been recommended to Athens by the Delphic oracle (7. 140 *supra*), and brought within the range of practical politics by Themistokles (8. 62 *supra*). There was thus a good deal in the recent experience of the Greeks, not to speak of the migrations and colonizations of earlier days, to make a wholesale flitting no absurd or unpractical idea. For the use of *ἀνάστασις* cp. Thuc. 2. 14. 2 (of the flitting of the Athenians from the country into the city 431 B.C.), 7. 75. 1 *τοῦ στρατεύματος* (of the break-up and departure before Syracuse in 413 B.C.), 1. 133 *ad f.* *ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ* (of the retirement from the temple by a suppliant). Cp. 4. 115

στάσιος τῆς Ἰωνίης, καὶ ὅκῃ χρεὸν εἴη τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατοικίσαι τῆς αὐτοὶ ἐγκρατέες ἦσαν, τὴν δὲ Ἰωνίην ἀπεῖναι τοῖσι βαρβάροισι· ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἐφαίνετό σφι εἶναι ἑωυτούς τε Ἰώνων προκατῆσθαι φρουρέοντας τὸν πάντα χρόνον, καὶ ἑωυτῶν μὴ προκατημένων Ἴωνας οὐδεμίαν ἐλπίδα εἶχον χαίροντας πρὸς τῶν Περσέων ἀπαλλάξειν. πρὸς ταῦτα Πελοποννησίων μὲν τοῖσι ἐν τέλεϊ ἐοῦσι ἐδόκεε τῶν μηδισάντων ἐθνέων τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν τὰ ἐμπολαῖα ἐξαναστήσαντας δοῦναι τὴν χώρην Ἴωσι ἐνοικῆσαι, Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκεε ἀρχὴν Ἰωνίην

7 *ὅπηι* **α** : *ὅπη* **B**C : *ὅποι* PMarc.*z* || *χρεὼν* CP*z*, van H. || *κατοικῆσαι* **B***z* 8 *ἔσαν* *z* : *εἴησαν* ? Stein(2) || *ἀπεῖναι* **B** : *ἀφεῖναι* 9 *ἑωυτούς τε* secl. van H. 10 *φρουρέων* R(S)V 11 *οὐδὲ μίαν* AB : *οὐδεμίην* *z* || *ἔχον* *z* 13 *τέλει* AB : *τέλεσι* *z* 14 *ἐμπολαῖα* Stein[2] : 'num forte *ἐπίπλοα* ?' van H. : *ἐμπόλια* **α**C Marc. : *ἐμπόρια* || *ἐπαναστήσαντας* **B**

supra φέρετε ἐξαναστέωμεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς τῆσδε.

7. **ὅκῃ . . τῆς Ἑλλάδος . . τῆς αὐτοὶ ἐγκρατέες ἦσαν.** If Ionia was to be evacuated and abandoned to the 'barbarians,' some place for the Ionians would have to be found on Hellenic soil. This problem appears to take the control or possession of Hellas proper (or the greater part of it) for granted; it assumes the truth of the *φήμη* of the day before (a night will presumably have intervened); or has the *φήμη* (of c. 100) by this time been officially confirmed by despatches to Samos? Or may this deliberation be taken as an undesigned confession that the victory in Boiotia had been fully reported to the Greeks at Samos or ever they advanced on Mykale? *Ἑλλάς* here comes very nearly to 'Greece' in our sense of the word. *ἐγκρατής* is used similarly 8. 49 *supra.* The imp. indic. *ἦσαν* is remarkable; =*εἰσί l.c.*

10. **προκατῆσθαι**: as in 8. 36 *supra*, and cp. also 7. 172.

τὸν πάντα χρόνον, 'for ever,' c. 73. 3.

11. **μή** as in a conditional sentence (participial).

χαίροντας πρὸς τῶν Περσέων ἀπαλλάξειν, 'will get off with impunity (go unpunished) at the hands of Persia.' Cp. 3. 69 *οὔτοι μιν . . δεῖ χαίροντα ἀπαλλάσσειν.* The negative is more usually combined with *χαίρων*, e.g. 3. 29 *ἀτάρ τοι ὑμεῖς γε οὐ χαίροντες γέλωτα ἐμὲ θήσεσθε*, Xenoph. *Anab.* 5. 6. 32 *διασπασθέντες δ' ἂν . . οὔτε χαίροντες ἂν ἀπαλλάξαιτε.*

12. **Πελοποννησίων μὲν τοῖσι ἐν τέλεϊ ἐοῦσι**: primarily Leotychidas, the Spartan king and navarch, and in the second line the captains of the Korinthians, Sikyonians, Troizenians. Two points raise suspicion: (i.) Could the king or the Synedrion have decided off-hand so immense and far-reaching a question? (ii.) Would the Dorian states at least have desired to reinforce the 'Ionian' element in Central Hellas, and in Peloponnese itself, by supporting such a proposal? *οἱ ἐν τέλεϊ* as in 3. 18, Thuc. 1. 10. 4 *ἔξω τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῶν μάλιστα ἐν τέλει*, 5. 47. 9 *οἱ τὰ τέλη ἔχοντες* (official term at Elis), 1. 58. 1 *τὰ τέλη τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων*, cp. 4. 15. 1, etc.

13. **ἐδόκεε**: a strict imperfect; the *δοκέον* did not become a *δόγμα*.

τῶν μηδισάντων ἐθνέων τῶν Ἑλ.: a preliminary list of them has been given 7. 132 *supra*, but the list is not complete, omitting the Argives (cp. 8. 73) and some islanders (Andros, the Karystians, etc.).

14. **τὰ †ἐμπολαῖα ἐξαναστήσαντας.** The *ἐξανάστασις* in this case was hardly to be accomplished without violence. *ἐμπολαῖα* is a conjectural emendation; cp. App. Crit. =*ἐμπόρια*. But the adj. *ἐμπολαῖος* is not common, and would mean (in the neuter) not 'markets,' but rather 'commodities.'

δοῦναι . . ἐνοικῆσαι: exactly as in Thuc. 2. 27. 2 *ἐκπεσοῦσι δὲ τοῖς Αἰγινήταις οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἔδοσαν Θυρέαν οἰκεῖν.* (Exegetical and telic, or gerundive.)

15. **ἀρχήν**, 'at all'—in the first instance; they moved in fact the

γενέσθαι ἀνάστατον οὐδὲ Πελοποννησίοισι περὶ τῶν σφετερέων ἀποικιέων βουλεύειν· ἀντιτεινόντων δὲ τούτων προθύμως, εἶξαν οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι. καὶ οὕτω δὴ Σαμίους τε καὶ Χίους καὶ Λεσβίους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους νησιώτας, οἳ ἔτυχον συστρατευόμενοι τοῖσι Ἕλλησι, *ἐς τὸ συμμαχικὸν ἐποιήσαντο, πίστι τε*

16 Πελοποννησίους Schweighaeuser, Holder, van H.: 'An deest *προσήκειν?*' Stein[2] || *σφετέρων* libri, Holder, van H. 17 *ἀποικίων* **B** || *τουτέων* z 19 <*καὶ ἠπειρώτας καὶ*>*νησιώτας* Schwartz: *νησιώτας* <*καὶ τοὺς ἠπειρώτας*> Steup: sed cf. Busolt III. i. 39 || *στρατευόμενοι* **B** 20 *ἐσεποιήσαντο* Krueger, Stein[3] || *πίστει* C Marc. || *τε* om. **a**C

previous question, and had also a formal or constitutional objection to urge, viz. against interference between a metropolis and its colonies. The metropolitan claim of Athens had been recognized and urged from the other side as early as 498 B.C., cp. 5. 97—and probably dated back at least to the days of Peisistratos (cp. c. 97 *supra*), but perhaps only referred to Miletos, and some of the mainland towns at first. It was, of course, a part of the basis of the Delian symmachy just afterwards, and was then perhaps more widely extended; cp. next note.

18. **καὶ οὕτω δή**: there might perhaps seem to be a *non sequitur* in these words, which throws doubt, not upon the fact here stated so much as upon the previous report of the debate in the Synedrion at Samos (cc. 90, 91). If Peloponnesians were not to be allowed *βουλεύειν περὶ τῶν* (*'Αττικῶν*) *ἀποικιέων*—and yielded the point—the matriculation of the 'Samians' and 'Chians' (which appear on the *Marmor Par.* 27 as colonies from Athens) might seem to be inconsistent therewith. But was the Ionian settlement in Samos rightly ascribed to Athens? The Ionians of Samos were ultimately traced back to Epidauros; cp. Pausan. 7. 4. 2 (cp. *Δωριέες* (*sic*) *'Επιδαύριοι* Hdt. 1. 146). The case of Chios is even more obscure; according to the native historian, Ion, a contemporary of Hdt.'s, the island was peopled by Abantes from Euboia (cp. Hdt. 1. 146), and by immigrants from Histiaia; their 'Ionization' they owed to a king Hektor, in the third generation after; but Ion failed to account for the Chians being reckoned Ionians (*οὐ μέντοι ἐκεῖνό γε εἴρηκε καθ' ἥντινα αἰτίαν Χῖοι τελοῦσιν ἐς Ἴωνας*, Pausan. 7. 4. 10). Possibly Samos and Chios, at least in 479 B.C., were not yet accounted 'Athenian' colonies; and even the passage in Hdt. 1. 146–7 distinguishes among the Ionians between *οἱ . . ἀπὸ τοῦ πρυτανηίου τοῦ 'Αθηναίων ὁρμηθέντες καὶ νομίζοντες γενναιότατοι εἶναι Ἰώνων* and the rest. (The passage in c. 147 making the *Apaturia* the test of Ionism admits that the Ephesians and Kolophonians did not observe it; but the passage is very like a gloss.) The Athenians might protest against any intervention between themselves and their settlements abroad, and yet allow the enrolment of Samos and Chios in the Hellenic alliance without a murmur, having (at this time at least) no metropolitan claim over these islands any more than over the Aiolian Lesbos. But the whole story of the deliberations is, of course, highly suspicious; the proposed *ἀνάστασις* would have meant a civil war, and the admirals could hardly have settled such a question.

19. **καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους νησιώτας** cannot refer to the islands enumerated in 8. 46 *supra*, for they already belonged to the Symmachy; the Greeks at Mykale, at Samos, at the Hellespont (cp. c. 114 *infra*) had Samians, Chians, Lesbians, and a good many other 'nesiotes' with them, *συστρατευόμενοι τοῖσι Ἕλλησι* (*sic*), who are completely ignored in the narrative of the actual operations, and only come into account in this highly suspicious passage on diplomatic and constitutional points. 'The Islands' were understood to be half the prize of Mykale, c. 101 *supra*.

20. **ἐς τὸ συμμαχικὸν ἐποιήσαντο**, 'admitted them as members of the alliance': *τὸ σ.* = *τοὺς συμμάχους*. Hdt. has *συμμαχίην . . ἐποιήσατο* 1. 77, *πόλιας . . ὑπ' ἑωυτοῖσι ἐποιήσαντο* 5. 103. Cp. Thuc. 3. 3. 4 *τοὺς ἄνδρας . .*

καταλαβόντες καὶ ὁρκίοισι <ἦ μὲν> ἐμμενέειν τε καὶ μὴ ἀποστήσεσθαι. τούτους δὲ καταλαβόντες ὁρκίοισι ἔπλεον τὰς γεφύρας λύσοντες· ἔτι γὰρ ἐδόκεον ἐντεταμένας εὑρήσειν. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἐπ' Ἑλλησπόντου ἔπλεον.

107 *Τῶν δὲ ἀποφυγόντων βαρβάρων ἐς τὰ ἄκρα τῆς Μυκάλης κατειληθέντων, ἐόντων οὐ πολλῶν, ἐγίνετο κομιδὴ ἐς Σάρδις. πορευομένων δὲ κατ' ὁδὸν Μασίστης ὁ Δαρείου παρατυχὼν τῷ πάθεϊ τῷ γεγονότι τὸν στρατηγὸν Ἀρταΰντην ἔλεγε πολλά τε καὶ κακά, ἄλλα τε καὶ γυναικὸς κακίω φὰς αὐτὸν εἶναι τοιαῦτα στρατηγήσαντα, καὶ ἄξιον εἶναι παντὸς κακοῦ τὸν βασιλέος οἶκον κακώσαντα. παρὰ δὲ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι γυναικὸς κακίω ἀκοῦσαι δέννος μέγιστος ἐστί. ὁ δὲ ἐπεὶ πολλὰ*

---

21 *ἦ μὲν* add. Krueger, van H., Stein[3] || *ἐμμενέειν* Stein, Holder: *ἐμμένειν* vel *ἐμμενεῖν* 22 *ἀπονοστήσεσθαι* SVz 24 *ἐλλήσποντον* S || *ἔπλωον* van H. **107.** 1 *ἄκρα τε* **B**, Holder, Kallenberg || *μυκάλλης* S 2 *ἐγένετο* R || *σάρδεις* R 5 *τε καὶ* om. Marc. || *εἶναι* om. Marc. 7 *βασιλῆος* z 8 *πολλά <τε καὶ κακὰ>* ? Krueger, van H.

ἐς φυλακὴν ἐποιήσαντο, 8. 1. 3 *τὰ τῶν ξυμμάχων ἐς ἀσφάλειαν ποιεῖσθαι.* But cp. App. Crit. The statement here may be reconciled with the statement in c. 92 *supra* by supposing that at Delos Hegesistratos and his two companions only bound themselves to do their best to bring the Samians into the alliance; but the harmony is a little strained—especially considering that the allies have been to Samos once already (c. 96) in the interval.

πίστι τε . . καὶ ὁρκίοισι, as in c. 92 *supra*.

21. **ἐμμενέειν τε καὶ μὴ ἀποστήσεσθαι**: this formula seems to presuppose a *ξυμμαχία ἐς ἀεί, ἐς τὸν πάντα χρόνον.* The right of *ἀπόστασις* is surrendered. The formula and the story may have been useful 'precedents' for the Delian alliance, which no doubt was equally unlimited in time (cp. *Ἀθ. πολ.* 23. 5).

22. **ἔπλεον τὰς γεφύρας λύσοντες.** Rawlinson (*ad l.*) suggests that the destruction of the bridges (8. 117) must have been already known (by Lesbians, for example) and that Hdt. has misconceived the motive of the move to the Hellespont, which was "only to reconnoitre." The Greeks will have aimed at more than that—promoting revolt, cutting off remnants, and so on. But is it so certain that they knew the bridges were no more, or might not be restored?

107. 1. **ἀποφυγόντων· κατειληθέντων· ἐόντων**: this string of participles is not elegant, but *ἀποφ.* is little more than an adjective; it might very well be dispensed with. *κατειληθέντων* here seems to mean 'crowded,' 'confined,' 'cooped up'; cp. 5. 119, 8. 27, cc. 31, 70 *supra* (*κατειλημένοι*). If there were so few of them, one would have thought Mykale roomy enough for them.

τὰ ἄκρα τ. Μ. = *τὰς κορυφὰς τ. Μ.* cc. 104, 99 *supra*.

2. **κομιδή**: cp. 8. 108 *supra*.

3. **Μασίστης ὁ Δαρείου**: he was full brother to Xerxes, cp. 7. 82 *supra*, and had been one of the six generals, or field-marshals, of the army in 480 B.C. It is odd to find him here a casual attaché of the naval forces, or of the *corps d'armée* in Ionia: nor is he! For he has a bodyguard, *οἱ δορυφόροι οἱ Μασίστεω infra*; was he, not Tigranes, the real commander of the six myriads, c. 96 *supra*? If so, he was not present at the disaster which had just taken place (*τῷ πάθεϊ τ. γ.*) but was probably coming to the support of the encampment at Mykale, and naturally fell foul of Artayntes (c. 102 *supra*).

5. **γυναικὸς κακίω**: cp. c. 20 *supra*.

6. **τὸν βασιλέος οἶκον**: cp. 8. 102 *supra*, 5. 31.

8. **ἀκοῦσαι**, 'to be called . .'

δέννος: the verb *δεννάζειν* occurs twice in Sophokles, *Antig.* 759, *Aias*

ἤκουσε, δεινὰ ποιεύμενος σπᾶται ἐπὶ τὸν Μασίστην τὸν ἀκινάκην, ἀποκτεῖναι θέλων. καί μιν ἐπιθέοντα φρασθεὶς Ξειναγόρης ὁ Πρηξίλεω ἀνὴρ Ἁλικαρνησσεὺς ὄπισθε ἑστεὼς αὐτοῦ [*Ἀρταΰντεω*], *ἁρπάζει μέσον καὶ ἐξαείρας παίει ἐς τὴν γῆν· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ οἱ δορυφόροι οἱ Μασίστεω προέστησαν. ὁ δὲ Ξειναγόρης ταῦτα ἐργάσατο χάριτα αὐτῷ τε Μασίστῃ τιθέμενος καὶ Ξέρξῃ, ἐκσῴζων τὸν ἀδελφεὸν τὸν ἐκείνου· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον Ξειναγόρης Κιλικίης πάσης ἦρξε δόντος βασιλέος. τῶν δὲ κατ' ὁδὸν πορευομένων οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλέον τούτων ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ἀπικνέονται ἐς Σάρδις.*

9 *ποιησάμενος* z 10 *ἀκινάκεα* z || *ἀποκτεῖναι θέλων* del. van H.: *θέλων* om. S || *φθὰς* z 11 *ὁ Πρηξίλεω* om. R: *πρηστίλεω* Ask. || *ἁλικαρνησεὺς* **β**C || *ὄπισθεν* R(S)VP Marc., Holder 12 *Ἀρταΰντεω* del. Stein[2] || *ἐξαείρας* Bredow, Stein, Holder, van H.: *ἐξαίρας* **α**: *ἐξᾴρας* z: *ἐξάρας* 13 *οἱ* poster. loc. om. **β** Marc. z, Holder 14 *χάριτας* Marc.: *χάριν* van H. 15 *θέμενος* Marc. || *ἐκσῴζων* van H., Stein[3]: *ἐκσώζων* 16 *Κιλικίης*: *Λυκίης* Krueger || *ἦρξε Κιλικίης πάσης* P: *πάσης ἦρξε Κιλικίης* z 17 *βασιλῆος* z || *πορευομένων βαρβάρων* **β**z || *ἐπὶ* Werfer, Schweighaeuser, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *ἔτι* 18 *ἐγένετο τούτων* CP Marc. z (*τουτέων* z) || *ἀλλὰ* Marc. || *σάρδεις* Marc.

243, and in Euripides, *Rhes.* 925. It is found previously also in Theognis 1211. The substantive (reproach, taunt) is rare.

ἐπεὶ πολλὰ ἤκουσε, 'when he had heard more than enough . .'

9. **δεινὰ ποιεύμενος**, 'in a rage . .'

σπᾶται ἐπὶ . . τὸν ἀκινάκην, 'draws his native sword upon Masistes,' as we say. On *ἀκινάκης* cp. 7. 54 *supra*.

10. **φρασθείς** (*ubi animadvertit*) seems less forcible than the Aldine *φθάς* (*praevertens*), but both would be *de trop.*

11. **Ξειναγόρης ὁ Πρηξίλεω.** Prexileos, or Praxilas, is a very uncommon name, and nothing more is known of this Halikarnassian (Praxilla of Sikyon, Pausan. 3. 13. 5, is also unrivalled). Xeinagoras, or Xenagoras, is less rare. Of this man nothing more is known than is here by Hdt. recorded, but the record is significant: (*a*) There were Greeks with the Persian forces after Mykale: this man, to be sure, would be a subject of Artemisia (less probably an exile, or adventurer). (*b*) His appointment as 'syennesis' of Kilikia is remarkable, and probably the first instance of the investiture of a Greek subject with a Persian governorship. (*c*) This fact (which belongs to the history of the *Pentekontaëteris*) may be regarded as more certain than the cause or occasion alleged by Hdt. for it. (*d*) Nevertheless as himself a Halikarnassian Hdt. will have had special interest and information in regard to this fellow-citizen.

The predecessor of Xeinagoras in Kilikia was Syennesis, or the *syennesis*, son of Oromedon, mentioned 7. 98 *supra*, who according to Aischyl. *Pers.* 326 lost his life at the battle of Salamis, leaving presumably no son to succeed him. This Halikarnassian may have founded a dynasty in Kilikia: the next governor of Kilikia known to history is the 'syennesis' of the *Anabasis*; cp. *l.c. supra*. (Rawlinson ventures to say that "Xeinagoras can only have occupied a subordinate position": thus indirectly charging Hdt. in this case with a serious and apparently wilful exaggeration of his fellow-citizen's greatness. Krueger's emendation shifts the venue to Lykia.)

12. **ἁρπάζει μέσον**: cp. Terent. *Ad.* 3. 2. 18 *sublimem medium arriperem et capite pronum in terram statuerem.*

ἐξαείρας is here quite literally intended; cp. Xenoph. *Kyr.* 2. 4. 14 *συναρπάσας ἐξῆρε*, Aristoph. *Knights* 1359 *ἄρας μετέωρον εἰς τὸ βάραθρον ἐμβαλῶ* (Valckenaer).

14. **ταῦτα ἐργάσατο χάριτα . . τιθέμενος**: *χάριν τίθεσθαι*, cp. c. 60 *supra*: an inverted predication (= *ταῦτα ἐργαζόμενος χάριν ἐτίθετο*).

17. **οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλέον τούτων**: a mere

108 Ἐν δὲ τῇσι Σάρδισι ἐτύγχανε ἐὼν βασιλεὺς ἐξ ἐκείνου

108. 1 Ἐν: ἐπὶ **B** || σάρδησιν R Marc.

confession of ignorance! For the formula cp. c. 41 *supra*. One would like to know what happened to Artayntes.

108. There follows here, by way of digression (cc. 108–113), a story of the King's Amour, or the Death of Masistes, which exhibits Hdt. at his best. A story could hardly be better told, or present more artfully the elements of a domestic tragedy, of a palace intrigue, started in passion and jealousy, culminating in torture, rebellion, death. One great defect the story, indeed, has from the moral point of view: it is the innocent who suffer, or who suffer most; the guilty king, the jealous and cruel queen, come off scot free. Two considerations may slightly relieve this objection from an aesthetic standpoint: Artaynta, the daughter of Masistes, has a good deal to answer for: she is the root of the mischief. Again, 'rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft,' and Masistes and his sons die with arms in their hands against the king. But it cannot be said that Hdt. makes anything of these *motifs*. As a historian he might plead (though it is not his way!) that the facts were as he stated them, painfully immoral, and aesthetically distressing. As a moralist he might plead that the true moral lay outside the story, in the suggestion of all that Hellas had been spared by the successful resistance to the Oriental despot, which had made such tragedies, possible in tyrants' houses, for ever impossible in Hellas! And, again, that he thus dismisses Xerxes, to go to his own place, the scorn and derision of all good men, with his lawless passions and his slavish submission to 'the law of the Medes and Persians,' his childish vanities (ἡσθεὶς περιβάλλεται) and his prodigal pleasures (ἡσθεὶς δὲ καὶ ταύτῃ), his humorous caprices (speeches to Masistes) and his capricious wrath (θυμωθείς). The dramatic narrative falls into five acts.

(i.) The scene in Sardes: Xerxes' passion for his brother Masistes' wife: her faithfulness and virtue! and the king's ruse to win her, by wedding his son Dareios to her daughter.

(ii.) The scene shifts to Susa: the king's still fouler transfer of his affections from his brother's wife to his son's wife, Artaynta.

(iii.) The fatal gift: the robe of Amestris the queen: her jealousy and error: destruction to the wife of Masistes, the mother of Artaynta!

(iv.) The king's birthday feast: the queen's request: the despot's involuntary humiliation.

(v.) The catastrophe: wreck of the house of Masistes. (Masistes rejects the king's overtures: the mutilation of his wife: the rebellion, and its defeat.)

It is an omission that Artaynta does not expressly share the fate of her family.

This story might almost rank with the Hebrew story of *Esther* as an illustration of life at the Persian court. But, except for the external reference above indicated, it lacks the national and popular setting, the political purpose, and therewith the ethical contents, which ennoble the Jewish tale. The Greek interest in this tale is purely reflexive. No Greek, whether man or woman, figures in this drama: the virtues of the wife of Masistes are purely domestic; her husband as the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, good man, husband, father, and yet rebel withal, prepared to work 'no end of ill' to the king, his brother, unites to some extent the rôles of Mordecai and Haman; the king himself cuts no great figure in either tale, but here he is less of a puppet and more of a curse, while behind and over all rises the terrible figure of Amestris, 'a fury slinging flame,' a barbarian fiend incarnate. (If Ahasuerus = Xerxes, Esther would = Amestris. But that cannot be, "if we accept the stories which Hdt. tells of Amestris," and which the Jews tell of Esther.)

1. **ἐν δὲ τῇσι Σάρδισι**: cp. 8. 117 *supra*; it is, however, a question whether Xerxes was in Sardes at this time, and not rather engaged, in upper Asia, in the reduction of the revolted satrapy of Babylon; cp. C. F. Lehmann, 'Xerxes und die Babylonier,' *Wochensch. f. Klass. Philologie*, 1900, 959–965, Ed. Meyer, *G.d.A.* iii. p. xiv.; Appendix VII. § 2.

ἐτύγχανε ἐών marks a coincidence, which is not causally related to the antecedents, or rather concomitants. Xerxes, as we are here given to understand, spent the winter of 480–79 B.C., and at least the whole of the ensuing

τοῦ χρόνου, ἐπείτε ἐξ Ἀθηνέων προσπταίσας τῇ ναυμαχίῃ φυγὼν ἀπίκετο. τότε δὴ ἐν τῇσι Σάρδισι ἐὼν ἄρα ἤρα τῆς Μασίστεω *γυναικὸς ἐούσης καὶ ταύτης ἐνθαῦτα. ὡς δέ οἱ προσπέμποντι οὐκ ἐδύνατο κατεργασθῆναι, οὐδὲ βίῃ προσεφέρετο προμηθεόμενος τὸν ἀδελφεὸν* Μασίστην· *τὠυτὸ δὲ τοῦτο εἶχε καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα· εὖ γὰρ ἐπίστατο βίης οὐ τευξομένη· ἐνθαῦτα δὴ* Ξέρξης *ἐργόμενος τῶν ἄλλων πρήσσει τὸν γάμον τοῦτον τῷ παιδὶ τῷ ἑωυτοῦ* Δαρείῳ, *θυγατέρα τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης καὶ* Μασίστεω, *δοκέων αὐτὴν μᾶλλον λάμψεσθαι ἢν ταῦτα ποιήσῃ· ἁρμόσας δὲ καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα ποιήσας ἀπήλαυνε ἐς* Σοῦσα· *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκεῖ τε ἀπίκετο καὶ ἠγάγετο ἐς*

---

2 *ἀθηναίων* BCRSV*z* 3 *δὴ* RS(V): *δὲ* || *ἄρα* del. Cobet, Holder, van H. || *ἔρα* **B**: 'an *ἠράσθη*?' Stein 5 *βίῃ* Stein[3]: *βίην* || *προσέφερε* **B**, Holder, van H. 6 *προμυθεόμενος* Marc. || *ἀδελφὸν* Marc. Priscian 18. 283: *τοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ* van H. || *Μασίστην* del. van H. || *ταυτὸ* C || *ἔχε* *z*: 'an *ἔσχε*?' Stein[1] 7 *εὖ τε γὰρ* **B**, Holder || *ἠπίστατο* Marc. || *τεξομένη* B[1] 8 *πρήσει* C 10 *λάμψασθαι* C 12 *ἐκεῖ τε* **a**C: *ἐκεῖσε* **B** etc.: *ἐκεῖσέ τε* van H., Holder

---

summer, in Sardes, presumably awaiting the issue of the campaign in Greece. Aischylos (*Persai*) makes Xerxes return direct from Athens to Susa.

3. **φυγών** accepts the representation of the king's return as a *φυγή*.

τότε δή: at the time of the battle of Mykale; or perhaps more generally throughout the period from his return to the battle of Mykale.

ἄρα: cp. c. 104. 3 *supra*. **ἄρα ἤρα** looks unfortunate. Stein compares the position of *ἄρα* here and in c. 9 *supra* and in 4. 134 (i.e. construes it with *ἐν τῇσι Σάρδισι ἐών*?).

τῆς Μασίστεω γυναικός: that this lady is anonymous in the story does not make for its credit. Was she possibly, like her daughter, an *Ἀρταΰντη*, and possibly again a relative, a sister, of the Artayntes who has figured above? Masistes apparently throughout has only one wife. She had not accompanied her lord on the march to Greece (cp. 7. 187), but had probably come down to meet him on his return to Sardes with Xerxes.

5. **προσπέμποντι**: sc. *ἀγγέλους*. The subject of **ἐδύνατο** may be *ἡ γυνή* (van H. takes it to be *τὸ ἐπεθύμει*).

6. **προμηθεόμενος**, 'out of respect for . .'; a genitive might be expected.

εἶχε, 'supported,' 'upheld.'

7. **εὖ γάρ κτλ.**, 'for she well knew that violence would not be employed against her.'

8. **ἐργόμενος** is middle; cp. 7. 197. 21 *supra*.

τὸν γάμον τοῦτον refers to the following *θυγατέρα*. The verb **πρήσσει** has, perhaps, a suggestion of intrigue: he indeed was hoping still to get hold of the mother (*λάμψεσθαι = λήψεσθαι*: cp. Smyth, *Ionic* § 130, p. 136).

9. **Δαρείῳ**: this Dareios was the eldest son, and on the assassination of his father in 465 B.C. was falsely accused of the crime, and executed by his youngest brother Artaxerxes; Ktesias, *Pers.* 29; Gilmore, p. 158 f. Had all this happened when this story was first contrived?

12. **ἐς Σοῦσα**: the scene shifts to the capital; cp. 8. 99, 7. 151 *supra*, and 5. 54.

ἠγάγετο: the middle is generally used of the bridegroom, here of the father-in-law. This word marks the actual marriage; the practices (*πρήσσει*) and the performances of the usual rites (*τὰ νομιζόμενα ποιήσας*), at Sardes previously, only amounted to a betrothal (*ἁρμόσας*). The crown-prince lives apparently in his father's palace, even after his marriage: is this improbable?

ἑωυτοῦ Δαρείῳ τὴν γυναῖκα, οὕτω δὴ τῆς Μασίστεω μὲν γυναικὸς ἐπέπαυτο, ὁ δὲ διαμειψάμενος ἤρα τε καὶ ἐτύγχανε τῆς Δαρείου μὲν γυναικὸς Μασίστεω δὲ θυγατρός· οὔνομα δὲ
109 τῇ γυναικὶ ταύτῃ ἦν Ἀρταΰντη. χρόνου δὲ προϊόντος ἀνάπυστα γίνεται τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. ἐξυφήνασα Ἄμηστρις ἡ Ξέρξεω γυνὴ φᾶρος μέγα τε καὶ ποικίλον καὶ θέης ἄξιον διδοῖ Ξέρξῃ. ὁ δὲ ἡσθεὶς περιβάλλεταί τε καὶ ἔρχεται παρὰ τὴν Ἀρταΰντην. ἡσθεὶς δὲ καὶ ταύτῃ ἐκέλευσε αὐτὴν αἰτῆσαι ὅ τι βούλεταί οἱ γενέσθαι ἀντὶ τῶν αὐτῷ ὑπουργημένων· πάντα γὰρ τεύξεσθαι αἰτήσασαν· τῇ δὲ κακῶς γὰρ ἔδεε πανοικίῃ γενέσθαι, πρὸς ταῦτα εἶπε Ξέρξῃ "δώσεις μοι τὸ ἄν σε αἰτήσω;" ὁ δὲ πᾶν μᾶλλον δοκέων κείνην αἰτῆσαι ὑπισχνέετο

---

14 <ἐρῶν> ἐπέπαυτο? van H. 15 μὲν om. Marc. || μασίστεωι B
109. 2 ἐξυφῄνασα Gaisford 3 φάρος BR Marc. z || ποικίλω Marc. 4 πρὸς Ask. 5 ταύτῃ: αὐτὴ **B** || ἐκέλευε Iacobitz 6 ὃ βούλεται R || οἱ om. **a**C Marc. (S) || οἱ . . ὑπουργημένων om. S(Gaisf.) || ὑποργημένων RV 7 αἰτήσασα Marc. 8 εἶπαι z || ἐάν **B** 9 πάντα **B**: πᾶν <ἂν> Madvig || ἐκείνην Sz || αἰτήσεσθαι **B**: αἰτήσειν Cobet, van H. || ὑπισχνέεται **B**: ὑπισχνεῖτο van H.

---

13. **οὕτω δὴ . . ἐπέπαυτο**: this pluperfect is plainly rhetorical, and not used of strict temporal sequence. **ὁ δέ**: the subject is re-expressed, and the *δέ* attached, for the sake of emphasis; cp. c. 106. 7 *supra.*

14. **διαμειψάμενος ἤρα,** 'transferred his affections': perhaps the *δια-* (in comp.) marks the completeness of the change, *ἤρα* **τε καὶ** *ἐτύγχανε* the rapidity of his success. For **τυγχάνειν** cp. 5. 23 (*ἔτυχε*), and *τευξομένη supra, τεύξεσθαι* c. 109 *infra.*

16. **Ἀρταΰντη**: the mere identity of name with Artayntes, c. 107 *supra*, is not, of course, sufficient to prove any connexion between the house of Masistes and that of his colleague and foeman; but the name is of ill-omen for the house anyway—and perhaps for that reason the daughter of Masistes bears it.

109. 1. **χρόνου δὲ προιόντος**: an interval occurs. **ἀνάπυστα γίνεται**: cp. 6. 64 *ἔδεε δὲ ὡς ἔοικε ἀνάπυστα γενόμενα ταῦτα καταπαῦσαι Δημάρητον τῆς βασιληίης.* The moment of 'discovery' is fateful.

2. **Ἄμηστρις ἡ Ξέρξεω γυνή**: she hardly requires the description after 7. 61, 114 *supra*; but this passage is, of course, independent of those, the second, indeed, of which is of later composition than this (and the former, perhaps, a gloss).

3. **φᾶρος . . θέης ἄξιον**: the hardiest advocate of the extension of Hdt.'s autopsy, and first-hand authority in general, will hardly venture to argue from this phrase that Hdt. had actually seen this plaid or pall: why then press the phrase elsewhere? Cp. cc. 25, 70 *supra.*

4. **ἡσθεὶς . . ἡσθείς**: such are a despot's 'pleasures'! Cp. note to c. 108 *supra.* There is some humour, perhaps, in the repetition.

6. **ἀντὶ τῶν αὐτῷ ὑπουργημένων,** 'in return for her services to him'; cp. *ὑπουργέειν* 8. 110, *χρηστὰ ὑπουργέειν* 8. 143, *ὑπουργήσειν* 7. 38 (of the despot himself).

7. **τεύξεσθαι** is absolute ('shall obtain her request'). **πάντα** with *αἰτήσασαν*, 'whatever she asked,' even if she asked everything.

τῇ δὲ κακῶς γὰρ ἔδεε πανοικίῃ γενέσθαι: the *δέ* is of course misplaced (unless we were to read *ᾗ δέ*). **πανοικίῃ,** 7. 39. *ἔδεε κακῶς γενέσθαι* is the coldest of fatalistic formulae; cp. 5. 33. It does not clearly appear what the fate of this woman was.

9. **πᾶν μᾶλλον δοκέων κτλ.**: cp. 7. 38 *supra.*

καὶ ὤμοσε. ἡ δὲ ὡς ὤμοσε ἀδεῶς αἰτέει τὸ φᾶρος. Ξέρξης δὲ παντοῖος ἐγίνετο οὐ βουλόμενος δοῦναι, κατ' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, φοβεόμενος δὲ Ἄμηστριν, μὴ καὶ πρὶν κατεικαζούσῃ τὰ γινόμενα οὕτω ἐπευρεθῇ πρήσσων· ἀλλὰ πόλις τε ἐδίδου καὶ χρυσὸν ἄπλετον καὶ στρατόν, τοῦ ἔμελλε οὐδεὶς ἄρξειν ἀλλ' ἢ ἐκείνη. Περσικὸν δὲ κάρτα ὁ στρατὸς δῶρον. ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἔπειθε, διδοῖ τὸ φᾶρος, ἡ δὲ περιχαρὴς ἐοῦσα τῷ δώρῳ ἐφόρεέ τε καὶ ἀγάλλετο. καὶ ἡ Ἄμηστρις πυνθάνεταί **110** *μιν ἔχουσαν· μαθοῦσα δὲ τὸ ποιεύμενον τῇ μὲν γυναικὶ ταύτῃ οὐκ εἶχε ἔγκοτον, ἣ δὲ ἐλπίζουσα τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς εἶναι αἰτίην καὶ ταῦτα ἐκείνην πρήσσειν, τῇ Μασίστεω γυναικὶ ἐβούλευε ὄλεθρον. φυλάξασα δὲ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἑωυτῆς*

---

10 *ὄμοσε* **a** (bis ?) || *φάρος* BR Marc. *z* 11 *ἐγένετο* CP*z* 12 *φοβούμενος* **B** || *δὲ* om. C || *ἄμιστριν* C || *καὶ* om. **B** || *κατεικαζούσῃ z*, Stein, van H.: *κατεικαζούσης* Schweighaeuser: *κατεικάζουσα* 13 *γενόμενα* Marc. || *ἐπορεύθη* **B**C || *πόλεις* C*d* 15 *ὁ στρατὸς κάρτα* **B**: *ὁ στρατὸς* (ante *κάρτα*) del. van H. 16 *φάρος* R Marc. *z* 17 *ἐγάλλετο* R: *ἠγάλλετο* P Marc. *z* **110.** 2 *ἔχουσα* C || *ταύτῃ*: *αὐτῇ* **B** 3 *ἔχε z*

---

10. **ἀδεῶς**, 'confidently,' sure of the result.

11. **παντοῖος ἐγίνετο**: cp. 7. 10. 30.

13. **ἐπευρεθῇ**: his detection would follow upon (*ἐπ-*) her previous (*πρίν*) suspicions, strong (*κατ-*) suspicions: the dative participle *κατεικαζούσῃ* is observable: a dat. of the agent, instead of *ὑπό* with genitive; cp. Madvig § 38 *g* (p. 37)—where the instances leave much to be desired.

πρήσσων refers here to decided malpractices! Cp. c. 108.

πόλις: cp. the assignment of the city of Anthylla to the wife of the Satrap of Egypt for 'shoe-money,' 2. 98; the assignations to Themistokles, Thuc. 1. 138. 5, etc.

ἐδίδου, 'offered,' kept offering, a strong imperf.; cp. 8. 114 *supra*.

14. **ἄπλετον**: a standing epithet of *χρυσός*; cp. 1. 14, 50, 215, 3. 106 (also with *οἰμωγή* 6. 58, 8. 99, c. 24 *supra*, *ὕδωρ* 8. 12, *ἅλες* 4. 53)—'gold beyond the dreams of avarice,' gold galore.

στρατόν seems the least likely to appeal to a lady: what would she do with it? Perhaps it is only introduced for the sake of the next learned remark. Or were Persian princesses too titular colonels at times?

16. **διδοῖ**, 'is giving,' 'gives,' seems a little weak after the *ἐδίδου* just above: a perfect or pluperfect here would do nicely.

110. 1. **πυνθάνεται**: by hearsay.

2. **μαθοῦσα**: by native wit; she did not, however, quite get at the facts.

τὸ ποιεύμενον: cp. c. 22 *supra*.

τῇ μὲν . . οὐκ εἶχε ἔγκοτον: she did not (presumably) suspect the intrigue between Xerxes and Artaynta (the younger), their son's bride, but thought perhaps that his visits to the daughter covered an intrigue with the mother, and that the mother had bestowed the *φᾶρος* on the daughter. She therefore planned the destruction of the wife of Masistes. The curtain descends upon the third act of this tragedy.

3. **ἔγκοτον**: 8. 29 *supra*.

ἣ δέ, 'but she . . '; the resumed subject annexes the particle, cp. c. 109. 13 *supra*.

ἐλπίζουσα: rather 'believing' than 'hoping,' cp. Index, *sub v.*

4. **ταῦτα ἐκείνην πρήσσειν**, 'that she was at the bottom of the whole business'—'intrigue.' The *ἐκείνην* is no more, strictly speaking, necessary than the *ἥ* just before, but its introduction makes for emphasis and lucidity. *πρήσσειν* as above.

5. **φυλάξασα δὲ . . προτιθέμενον**, 'she waited her own husband's holding a royal feast,' i.e. a royal feast held by her own husband Xerxes. *φυλάσσειν*, cp.

Ξέρξην βασιλήιον δεῖπνον προτιθέμενον· τοῦτο δὲ τὸ δεῖπνον παρασκευάζεται ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἡμέρῃ τῇ ἐγένετο <ὁ> βασιλεύς· οὔνομα δὲ τῷ δείπνῳ τούτῳ περσιστὶ μὲν τυκτά, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν τέλειον· τότε καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν σμᾶται μοῦνον βασιλεὺς καὶ Πέρσας δωρέεται. ταύτην δὴ τὴν ἡμέρην φυλάξασα ἡ Ἄμηστρις χρηίζει τοῦ Ξέρξεω δοθῆναί οἱ τὴν Μασίστεω γυναῖκα. ὁ δὲ δεινόν τε καὶ ἀνάρσιον ἐποιέετο τοῦτο μὲν ἀδελφεοῦ γυναῖκα παραδοῦναι, τοῦτο δὲ ἀναιτίην ἐοῦσαν τοῦ πρήγματος τούτου·
111 *συνῆκε γὰρ τοῦ εἵνεκεν ἐδέετο. τέλος μέντοι ἐκείνης τε λιπαρεούσης καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἐξεργόμενος, ὅτι ἀτυχῆσαι τὸν χρηίζοντα οὔ σφι δυνατόν ἐστι βασιληίου δείπνου προ-*

---

7 *ἐν ἡμέρῃ* **B**, Holder, van H. || *ἐγίνετο* A || *ὁ βασιλεύς* **B**: articulum om. Stein, Holder, van H. 8 *τικτὰ* S 9 *τὴν* om. **B** || *τέλειον*: *τέλεον* Holder, van H. || (‘*τὴν* om. R’ Stein[1] ?) 10 *τοὺς πέρσας* S: *Πέρσαις* z 11 *χρήιζει* P: *χρήζει* Marc.: *χρήξει* **B** (ap. Holder: *δέεται* S ap. Gaisf.): *χρῄζει* z 15 *ἕνεκεν* Marc. **111.** 1 *μέντοι γε* **B**, Holder || *κείνης* C || *τε* om. C 3 *χρήιζοντα* P: *χρήζοντα* R(**B** ?) Marc.: *χρῄζοντα* z, Gaisford

---

1. 48 *φυλάξας τὴν κυρίην τῶν ἡμερέων.* **δεῖπνον προτίθεσθαι**, of the king; cp. *ξείνια προθεῖναι* 7. 29.

7. **τῇ ἐγένετο <ὁ> βασιλεύς**, ‘on the king’s birthday’: a strong *ἐγένετο*, cp. 1. 133 *τῇ ἕκαστος ἐγένετο.* (Not a mere Accession celebration, on the day when he became king!) <*ὁ*> *βασιλεύς*, sc. *ὁ ἀεὶ β.* 1. 133 illustrates the importance of birthday feasts among the Persians, who were no pessimists (like Thrakians, cp. 5. 4).

8. **τυκτά**: *tacht*; not from *τυκτός*. The interesting philological note, even if from Hdt.’s own pen, will not convince any one that Hdt. was deeply versed in Persian; cp. 8. 85 *supra*.

9. **τὴν κεφαλὴν σμᾶται**: cp. 4. 73 *σμησάμενοι τὰς κεφαλάς* (*ἐκσμᾶν* 3. 148). The meaning here must be that on his birthday and on his birthday alone (*τότε μοῦνον*) the king appears without his tiara, or crown (Stein), his hair glistening with the oil of gladness.

12. **δεινόν τε καὶ ἀνάρσιον ἐποιέετο**, ‘thought it shocking and monstrous’ (*ἀνάρσιος* c. 37 *supra*), for two reasons: **τοῦτο μέν**, to hand over his brother’s wife to certain torture and death (he knew what was in store for her); **τοῦτο δέ**, she being innocent in the whole affair.

15. **συνῆκε γὰρ τοῦ εἵνεκεν ἐδέετο**, ‘he knew with what object she was making the request of him.’ There had probably been previous words on the subject between Amestris and Xerxes. *συνῆκα* is the Attic form (Ep. *ξυνέηκα*). **ἐδέετο**, cp. 8. 3.

111. 2. **λιπαρεούσης**: c. 45 *supra*.

ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἐξεργόμενος: cp. *ἀναγκαίῃ ἐξέργομαι* 7. 96, 139 *supra*. As to the *νόμος*, Xerxes was not equal to the occasion, or his sages and councillors would have come to the rescue; cp. the Response of the Royal Justices 3. 31, *τῷ βασιλεύοντι Περσέων ἐξεῖναι ποιέειν τὸ ἂν βούληται.* The two cases are not, indeed, precisely the same; but the moral is that the king was not bound by any law. Besides, **τὸν χρηίζοντα** (masc.) might have given them a loophole!

ἀτυχῆσαι, ‘to fail’; the opposite of *τυχεῖν*, cp. c. 108 *supra*.

3. **σφι**: sc. *τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι.*

δυνατόν: *fas*, 7. 149 *supra*. ‘O Kate, nice customs curtsy to great kings’ (*Henry V.* v. ii. 293). But Custom still was king o’ the king of kings! Cp. 3. 38.

κειμένου, κάρτα δὴ ἀέκων κατανεύει, καὶ παραδοὺς ποιέει ὧδε· τὴν μὲν κελεύει ποιέειν τὰ βούλεται, ὁ δὲ μεταπεμψάμενος τὸν ἀδελφεὸν λέγει τάδε. "Μασίστα, *σὺ εἷς* Δαρείου *τε παῖς καὶ ἐμὸς ἀδελφεός, πρὸς δ' ἔτι τούτοισι καὶ εἷς ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός· γυναικὶ δὴ ταύτῃ τῇ νῦν συνοικέεις μὴ συνοίκεε, ἀλλά τοι ἀντ' αὐτῆς ἐγὼ δίδωμι θυγατέρα τὴν ἐμήν. ταύτῃ συνοίκεε· τὴν δὲ νῦν ἔχεις, οὐ γὰρ δοκέει ἐμοί, μὴ ἔχε γυναῖκα."* *ὁ δὲ* Μασίστης *ἀποθωμάσας τὰ λεγόμενα λέγει τάδε.* "*ὦ δέσποτα, τίνα μοι λόγον λέγεις ἄχρηστον, κελεύων* [*μοι*] *γυναῖκα, ἐκ τῆς μοι παῖδές τε νεηνίαι εἰσὶ καὶ θυγατέρες, τῶν καὶ σὺ μίαν τῷ παιδὶ τῷ σεωυτοῦ ἠγάγεο γυναῖκα, αὐτή τέ μοι κατὰ νόον τυγχάνει κάρτα ἐοῦσα· ταύτην με κελεύεις μετέντα θυγατέρα τὴν σὴν γῆμαι; ἐγὼ δὲ βασιλεῦ μεγάλα μὲν ποιεῦμαι ἀξιεύμενος θυγατρὸς τῆς σῆς, ποιήσω μέντοι*

---

5 *ὧιδε* P || *μεταμειψάμενος* Marc. 6 *σὺ* <*γὰρ*> coni. Stein(2), recep. van H. 8 *δὲ* **β** Marc. *z* || *νυν* AB 9 *ἀλλά . . συνοίκεε* om. R || *θυγατέρα δίδωμι* S 10 *δοκέεις* R || *μοι* **β** || *μήκετι*? van H. 11 *ἀποθωυμάσας* P*z*, Stein[1] 12 *λόγον μοι* A 13 *μοι* **α**CP*z* etc. Stein[1]: *με* **β**, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: secl. Stein[3] || *τε* post *νεηνίαι* **β**P*z*, Stein[1], Holder || *εἰσὶ τρεῖς* *z* 14 *καὶ* om. **β** || *μία* R(**β**?): *μίην* *z* || *τῷ* poster. l. om. C Marc. || *ἠγάγετο* R(**β**?): *ἤγαγες* Marc. || *αὔτη* CP*z* 15 *τυγχάνει κατὰ νόον* C || *με* om. CP: *μὲν* R(**β**?) 16 *μετέντα* **β**: *μεθέντα* || *τὴν* om. **β** || *σὴν*: *σεωυτοῦ* *z*, van H. || *μέγα* **β**, Holder, van H. 17 *ἀξόμενος* Marc.

---

4. **κατανεύει**, frequent in Homer, but rare in prose (Plato, *Rep.* 350 E, seems to use the word literally. Here it may be used metaphorically, 'assents').

ποιέει ὧδε . . ὁ δέ: the curtain rises upon the last act of the tragedy; the desperate effort of Xerxes to make things right with his brother, the barbarities of Amestris in her revenge, the splendid crime of Masistes, and the doom that just anticipates his treasonable success. **ὁ δέ**, cp. c. 108. 13 *supra*.

5. **ποιέειν** after *ποιέει* is rather thin.

6. **Δαρείου**: i.e. the son of Hystaspes. (Atossa is not mentioned, but cp. 7. 82.)

7. **εἷς ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός**: more, perhaps, than he could say for all his brothers. Masistes could scarcely have returned the compliment with truth.

9. **δίδωμι θυγατέρα τὴν ἐμήν**, 'I offer you my daughter,' in marriage; she is, therefore, niece to Masistes. Such near marriages were not illegal even in Sparta (cp. 7. 239 *supra*), much less in polygamous Persia.

10. **ἔχεις· ἔχε**, 'have to wife'; cp. 7. 61. 13.

δοκέει, 'seems good.'

11. **ἀποθωμάσας**, 'when he had recovered from his astonishment'; cp. 8. 65 *supra*.

12. **ἄχρηστον**: a *meiosis*, 'injurious,' inexpedient.

14. **αὐτή τέ μοι κατὰ νόον . . ἐοῦσα**: cp. the story of Anaxandridas 5. 39, who was allowed to retain his first wife. Masistes might be puzzled in Persia to know why marrying the king's daughter should involve putting away his first wife (and might have suspected Xerxes of too personal an interest in the matter); but even in the Harem there is a chief wife or sultana, and this fact is perhaps taken for granted in the story.

16. **γῆμαι**, of the bridegroom (*γήμασθαι*, of the bride; e.g. 4. 117).

μεγάλα μὲν ποιεῦμαι, 'account it greatness,' 'am highly honoured'; the plural is observable, cp. 1. 119 *μεγάλα ποιησάμενος*.

τούτων οὐδέτερα. σὺ δὲ μηδαμῶς βιῶ πρήγματος τοιοῦδε δεόμενος· ἀλλὰ τῇ τε σῇ θυγατρὶ ἀνὴρ ἄλλος φανήσεται ἐμεῦ οὐδὲν ἥσσων, ἐμέ τε ἔα γυναικὶ τῇ ἐμῇ συνοικέειν." ὁ μὲν δὴ τοιούτοισι ἀμείβεται, Ξέρξης δὲ θυμωθεὶς λέγει τάδε. "οὕτω τοι, Μασίστα, πέπρηκται· οὔτε γὰρ ἄν τοι δοίην θυγατέρα τὴν ἐμὴν γῆμαι, οὔτε ἐκείνῃ πλεῦνα χρόνον συνοικήσεις, ὡς μάθῃς τὰ διδόμενα δέκεσθαι." ὁ δὲ ὡς ταῦτα ἤκουσε, εἴπας τοσόνδε ἐχώρεε ἔξω "δέσποτα, οὐ δή κού με
112 *ἀπώλεσας;" ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ διὰ μέσου χρόνῳ, ἐν τῷ Ξέρξης τῷ ἀδελφεῷ διελέγετο, ἡ Ἄμηστρις μεταπεμψαμένη τοὺς δορυφόρους τοῦ Ξέρξεω διαλυμαίνεται τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ Μασίστεω· τούς τε μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα κυσὶ προέβαλε καὶ*

---

18 *τουτέων* z || *οὐδέτερον* **B** || *τοιούτου* R(S ?)V 20 *ἥσσω* z: *ἕσσων* Schaefer, van H. || *συνοικεῖν* R(S)V, van H. 21 *τούτοισιν ἀμείβετο* **B** 22 *οὕτω τοι*: *οὕτω δή τοι* z || *δοίην ἔτι* R(S ?)V, Holder, van H.: *δώιην* **a**: *δώην* CP Marc. 23 *γῆμαι*: *γυναῖκα* **B**, Holder, van H. || *ἔτι πλεῦνα* **B**z 24 *ὡς* pr. l. om. Marc. || *ἤκουσε ταῦτα* **B** 25 *κώ* Schaefer, van H. 26 *ἀπώλεσας;* Stein: volgo punctum ponitur **112.** 1 *ἐν ᾧ* **B** 2 *ἀδελφῷ* Marc. || *ἄμητρις* Ask. hic et alibi 3 *τοῦ*: *τοὺς* Krueger || *τοῦ*: *τὴν* **B**z, Holder, van H. 4 *μασίστεωι* B || *μαστοὺς* **B**

---

18. **μηδαμῶς βιῶ . . δεόμενος**, 'do not press (insist on) thy request.'

22. **πέπρηκται**: *ita sane* (οὕτω) *actum est de te* (Baehr); *igitur hoc profecisti* (Schweighaeuser); *deine Sache steht jetzt so* (Stein, taking **οὕτω** to refer to what follows).

24. **ὡς μάθῃς τὰ διδόμενα δέκεσθαι**, 'that you may learn to accept what is offered to you.' This must be almost a proverbial expression; cp. 8. 26, 137 *supra*.

25. **εἴπας τοσόνδε ἐχώρεε ἔξω**, 'all he said before going out was . .'

οὐ δή κού με ἀπώλεσας; 'can it be thou hast undone me?' The v.l. *κω* gives a good sense: *nondum sane me perdidisti* (Baehr); 'thou hast not yet taken my life' (Rawlinson), i.e. there is still fight left in me; I am not at the end of my resources (of course with a period, not an interrogative); this well accords with the sequel.

112. 1. **ἐν δὲ τούτῳ κτλ.**: the second pitiless scene in this act of the tragedy: non tamen intus | digna geri promes in scaenam, multaque tolles | ex oculis, quae mox narret facundia praesens (Hor. *de A. p.* 182 ff.). What a meeting between the faithful wife and her fond husband! What vows of vengeance by the stalwart sons, what tears and lamentation of the daughters, over the mother's dying bed! What self-reproaches of the guilty one before her self-inflicted end! It is in a way strange that no Greek playwright ever utilized the material lying to his hand in the pages of Hdt.

3. **διαλυμαίνεται**: the simple verb *λυμαίνεσθαι* is common, cp. 8. 28 *supra*; the prep., of course, strengthens it. The perfect part. *infra* is passive.

4. **τούς τε μαζούς**: cp. 4. 202. If the **ἀποταμοῦσα** is taken to extend down as far as *χείλεα*, and the **ἐκταμοῦσα** as applying only to *γλῶσσαν*, there is grammatically an asyndeton; probably the **καί** after *προέβαλε* connects that verb with *ἀποπέμπει* and *ἐκταμοῦσα* 'governs' *ῥῖνα, ὦτα, χείλεα* as well as *γλῶσσαν*. But the sentence is unsightly from every point of view. It sounds barbarous, savage, unhellenic enough; but it curiously resembles the threat of Antinoos to Iros, *Od.* 18. 84 ff. *πέμψω σ' ἤπειρόνδε, βαλὼν ἐν νηῒ μελαίνῃ, | εἰς Ἔχετον βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων, ὅς κ' ἀπὸ ῥῖνα τάμῃσι καὶ οὔατα νηλέϊ χαλκῷ, | μήδεά τ' ἐξερύσας δώῃ κυσὶν ὠμὰ δάσασθαι.*

ῥῖνα καὶ ὦτα καὶ χείλεα καὶ γλῶσσαν ἐκταμοῦσα ἐς οἶκόν μιν ἀποπέμπει διαλελυμασμένην. ὁ δὲ Μασίστης οὐδέν κω 113
ἀκηκοὼς τούτων, ἐλπόμενος δέ τί οἱ κακὸν εἶναι, ἐσπίπτει δρόμῳ ἐς τὰ οἰκία. ἰδὼν δὲ διεφθαρμένην τὴν γυναῖκα, αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα συμβουλευσάμενος τοῖσι παισὶ ἐπορεύετο ἐς Βάκτρα σύν τε τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ υἱοῖσι καὶ δή κου τισὶ καὶ ἄλλοισι ὡς ἀποστήσων νομὸν τὸν Βάκτριον καὶ ποιήσων τὰ μέγιστα κακῶν βασιλέα· τά περ ἂν καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἐμοὶ

6 μιν om. Marc. **113.** 1 κω om. Marc. 2 δέ τί: δ' ἔτι R(**B**) || οἶ R 5 βάκτραν C || που Marc. 6 νόμον CR Marc. 7 κακὸν Marc. || βασιλῆα z

113. 2. **ἀκηκοὼς . . ἐλπόμενος**: the former participle is clearly stronger than *ἀκούσας*, the latter is clearly not 'hoping.'

3. **διεφθαρμένην**, 'utterly ruined' (but not necessarily 'dead'); cp. 1. 34 *οὕτερος μὲν διέφθαρτο, ἦν γὰρ δὴ κωφός*, 38 *τὸν γὰρ δὴ ἕτερον διεφθαρμένον τὴν ἀκοὴν οὐκ εἶναί μοι λογίζομαι.* But obviously the miserable woman could not long survive such treatment.

αὐτίκα μετὰ ταῦτα introduces the last scene (shifted to Baktria), where, after conspiring with his sons, Masistes raises the flag of revolt in his satrapy, and falls, his brave boys fighting round him, at the head of an army of devoted adherents, in battle against the all too loyal subjects of the feeble tyrant.

5. **Βάκτρα**, the city of Balkh, capital of the *Βάκτριος νομός*, or Baktrian satrapy (3. 93), of which he was governor (*ὕπαρχος τῶν Βακτρίων* = *Βακτριανῶν l.c.*). The city is mentioned 6. 9 (as a sort of *ultima Thule* of the Persian Empire from the Greek point of view; but cp. 4. 204). On the Baktrians cp. 7. 64 *supra*, where the *Σάκαι* are associated with them, as here.

7. **τά περ ἂν καὶ ἐγένετο**, but did not, for Xerxes took measures to crush him. Hdt. implies that Masistes did not reach Baktra, or the Baktrian land, but was overtaken on the way thither, and came to an end. The mention of his army, however (*καὶ τὴν στρατιὴν τὴν ἐκείνου*), seems hardly consistent with that view, which is also not in itself probable; Masistes and his sons would have reached Baktria long before the army collected and sent against them by Xerxes. Hdt. is led into the inconsistency and error apparently by his own notion (**ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν**) that, if Masistes had once succeeded in raising a revolt in Baktria, he would have wrought the king no end of woe; in other words, the ease with which Masistes was suppressed convinced Hdt. that he had not actually raised a rebellion in Baktria, and as the Baktrians were devoted to Masistes, he cannot have reached Balkh, or he would have raised a rebellion.

Probably Masistes, as satrap of Baktria, did raise the province, and fell fighting at the head of the eastern levies of the empire. The gruesome story just related was an attempt to explain the cause of the revolt in terms acceptable to Hellenic romance. There may have been a set of more political factors at work. There was a constant possibility in the Achaimenid Empire of a rupture between the eastern and western halves, the Iranian highland, and the older centres and areas of secular civilization. The weakness of Xerxes, and the ignominious failure of the European expedition, were calculated to provoke disloyalty. Masistes, his brother, was but re-enacting the rôle of Bardiya, the son of Kyros the Great; Xerxes, or his servants, succeeded, as Kambyses, or again as Dareios had succeeded, in reasserting the unity of the empire. Masistes, who like Xerxes himself united both strains in the Achaimenid pedigree (cp. 7. 11 *supra*), was a very formidable Pretender, and a far better man evidently than his brother. Rawlinson (*ad l.*) seems to underestimate the possibilities of a Baktrian secession, or Home-rule movement, though he is justified in correcting the excesses of Blakesley in the other direction. The loyalty of the Baktrians to Dareios and their general loyalty to the Achaimenid

δοκέειν, εἴ περ ἔφθη ἀναβὰς ἐς τοὺς Βακτρίους καὶ τοὺς Σάκας· καὶ γάρ ἔστεργόν μιν καὶ ἦν ὕπαρχος τῶν Βακτρίων, ἀλλὰ γὰρ Ξέρξης πυθόμενος ταῦτα ἐκεῖνον πρήσσοντα, πέμψας ἐπ' αὐτὸν στρατιὴν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ κατέκτεινε αὐτόν τε ἐκεῖνον καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν στρατιὴν τὴν ἐκείνου. κατὰ μὲν τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν Ξέρξεω καὶ τὸν Μασίστεω θάνατον τοσαῦτα ἐγένετο.

114 Οἱ δὲ ἐκ Μυκάλης ὁρμηθέντες Ἕλληνες ἐπ' Ἑλλησπόντου πρῶτον μὲν περὶ Λεκτὸν ὅρμεον, ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἀπολαμφθέντες, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἀπίκοντο ἐς Ἄβυδον καὶ τὰς γεφύρας εὗρον διαλελυμένας, τὰς ἐδόκεον εὑρήσειν ἔτι ἐντεταμένας, καὶ τουτέων οὐκ ἥκιστα εἵνεκεν ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἀπίκοντο. τοῖσι μέν νυν ἀμφὶ Λευτυχίδην Πελοποννησίοισι ἔδοξε ἀποπλέειν ἐς τὴν

8 δοκέει z: δοκεῖ van H. 9 τέ μιν **B** Marc. z, Holder, van H. 11 κτείνει **B**: κατέκτειναν z 12 πέδας z || ὠὐτοῦ z **114.** 1 ἐπὶ Marc. 2 ὅρμεον **a**SV: ὥρμεον || ὑπὸ ἀνέμων om. Marc. 4 τουτέων z, Stein³: τούτων 5 ἕνεκα z 6 λευτυχίδεα **B** Marc. z

House (based upon the *argumentum a silentio*) might not prevent their preferring a Masistes to a Xerxes. The failure of Masistes in the end may have been due to the fact that the flower of the Baktrians had been culled by Mardonios (cp. 8. 113 *supra*), and their bones were now enriching the plain of Boiotia. The exact date of Masistes' attempt is problematic; but it falls, no doubt, into the *Pentekontaëteris*.

114. 1. **ἐκ Μυκάλης**: in c. 106 *supra* the Greeks have been conveyed from Mykale back to Samos, and have started from Samos for the Hellespont. Moreover, it was only at Samos (according to that passage) that they had decided on their policy.

ὁρμηθέντες, of physical motion (cp. 7. 37. 6, 7).

2. **Λεκτόν**: the position of Lekton is more nearly indicated by Thucydides 8. 101. 3. It is the SW. corner of the Troad, the extreme projection of Mount Ida (as is implied even in Homer, *Il.* 14. 283–4), now Cape Baba, or Sta. Maria—the most westerly point of the continent of Asia.

ὅρμεον, though from another verb, is not very happy in juxtaposition. Cp. ὅρμεον . . ὁρμώμενοι 7. 22. 3, 4.

ἀπολαμφθέντες, *intercepti* (Valla); cp. 2. 115. Wesseling compares Livy 37. 37 Eumenes rex, conatus primo ab Hellesponto reducere classem in hiberna Elaeam, adversis deinde ventis quum aliquot diebus superare Lecton promontorium non potuisset, in terram egressus . . in castra Romana (ad caput Caici amnis) cum parva manu contendit. But Eumenes (in 190 B.C.) was going from the Hellespont to the Caicus; the Greeks in 479 B.C. from Samos to the Hellespont. Violent north, or west, winds would have held them up: would wind from any quarter but the south have hindered Eumenes? (Perhaps the west? ζεφύρου τε καὶ νότου εἵνεκα 7. 36 *supra*.)

3. **Ἄβυδον**: cp. 8. 130, etc. As to the bridges, and the policy of going to the Hellespont, cp. c. 106 *supra*.

6. **ἔδοξε**, 'Leotychidas and his Peloponnesian following decided . .' **ἀμφί**, cp. c. 69 *supra*; with ἔδοξε contr. ἐδόκεε c. 106 *supra*. Stein (*ad l.*) understands Thuc. 1. 90 to represent Leotychidas and the Peloponnesians as going straight home from Samos; but the case is not quite clear. Thucydides does not, indeed, expressly record the removal to the Hellespont; but neither does he expressly say that it was Samos wherefrom the Peloponnesians returned; he merely says, the Peloponnesians returned, the Athenians remained. On this point there is no contradiction between Hdt. and Thuc.

Ἑλλάδα, Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ καὶ Ξανθίππῳ τῷ στρατηγῷ αὐτοῦ ὑπομείναντας πειρᾶσθαι τῆς Χερσονήσου. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἀπέπλεον, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἀβύδου διαβάντες ἐς τὴν Χερσόνησον Σηστὸν ἐπολιόρκεον. ἐς δὲ τὴν Σηστὸν ταύτην, ὡς ἐόντος **115**
ἰσχυροτάτου τείχεος τῶν ταύτῃ, συνῆλθον, ὡς ἤκουσαν παρεῖναι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον, ἔκ τε τῶν ἀλλέων τῶν περιοικίδων, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐκ Καρδίης πόλιος Οἰόβαζος ἀνὴρ Πέρσης, ὃς τὰ ἐκ τῶν γεφυρέων ὅπλα ἐνθαῦτα ἦν κεκομικώς. εἶχον δὲ ταύτην ἐπιχώριοι Αἰολέες, συνῆσαν δὲ Πέρσαι τε καὶ

8 χερρονήσου CP 9 διαβαλόντες **B**, Holder || χερρόνησον CP
115. 3 ἀλλέων Stein : ἄλλων || τῶν om. S, Ask. 4 δὴ καὶ : δὴ **B** || οἰάβαζος **B** 6 ἔχον z

7. **Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ καὶ Ξανθίππῳ**, 'the Athenians and their strategos, Xanthippos,' decided to remain and attempt the recovery of the Chersonese. Hdt. does not make clear, what Thuc. *l.c.* expressly records, that the new allies—*οἱ ἀπ' Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου ξύμμαχοι, ἤδη ἀφεστηκότες ἀπὸ βασιλέως*—remained with the Athenians and assisted them. Xanthippos is here named for the first time since 8. 131 (but without his patronymic); not much credit is given him for the victory of Mykale.

αὐτοῦ: not quite strictly 'on the spot,' for they move across to Sestos; it refers perhaps rather to 'the Hellespont' than to 'Abydos.'

8. **ὑπομένειν** has four meanings or uses in Hdt. (*a*) 'To remain behind,' as here; cp. *τὸ ὑπομένον ἐν Σπάρτῃ* 7. 209. (*b*) 'To await, sustain, an attack,' a defensive attitude; cp. 4. 3 *οὐκ ὑπομενέουσι* (as enemies, cp. 7. 101, 120, and c. 23 *supra*). (*c*) Simply 'to await' (as a friend), 3. 9 *ὑπέμενε ἐνθαῦτα τὸν Καμβύσεω στρατόν* (as friends). (*d*) Absolutely, 'to abide,' to survive; 4. 149 *οὐ γὰρ ὑπέμειναν τὰ τέκνα.*

9. **τὴν Χερσόνησον**: the Chersonese 'on the Hellespont' last mentioned 7. 58 (cp. 7. 33. 3, where it should have been noted that the name had occurred previously c. 22. 3 without further specification, a fact pointing to the independence of the two passages). Thucydides speaks of it always, like Hdt. here, simply as 'the Chersonese.' Our oldest authority for the designation *ἡ Θρᾳκία Χερρόνησος* appears to be Strabo 92, etc. Cp. 6. 33 *supra.*

10. **Σηστόν**: last mentioned in 7. 78; cp. 7. 33. It was an old possession of the Athenians; cp. 4. 143, and 6. 34, etc. Sestos was, or was to be made, *φρούριον καὶ φυλακὴ τοῦ παντὸς Ἑλλησπόντου* (cp. Thuc. 8. 62. 3).

115. 1. **ταύτην**: there was only one Sestos; the demonstrative is purely stylistic, referring to the previous nomination.

ὡς ἐόντος, 'it being . .' as a matter of fact (cp. *ὡς οὐ παρεόντος αὐτοῦ* 8. 69 *supra*); the gender is determined by *τείχεος.*

2. **συνῆλθον**: sc. *οἱ περίοικοι* (cp. *τῶν περιοικίδων*), or, more probably, *ἄνδρες Πέρσαι*, out of *ἀνὴρ Πέρσης* below, just as *ἀλλέων* sc. *πολίων* out of *πόλιος*. But has a word or two dropped out before **καὶ δὴ καί**? (Cp. cc. 101. 14, 102. 6 *supra.*)

4. **Καρδίης**: cp. 7. 58 *supra.*

Οἰόβαζος: on this name cp. 7. 68 *supra.*

5. **ἐνθαῦτα ἦν κεκομικώς**: is this expression merely equivalent to *ἐνθαῦτα ἐκεκομίκει*? If so, why not *ἐκεῖσε* instead of *ἐνθαῦτα*? The substantive or auxiliary verb has at least affected the adverb! But *ἐνθαῦτα ἦν* is a complete statement in itself, save that *τὰ* [*ἐκ*] *τῶν γεφυρέων ὅπλα* demands a governing verb. Moreover, *ἐνθαῦτα* might = *ἐν Καρδίῃ* if *ἦν κ.* simply = *ἐκεκομίκει*. In fine *ἦν κεκομικώς* is not a mere temporal pluperfect, used indifferently with the thematic form, or the aorist; it records an action, past indeed, but of still abiding effect. In this case perhaps even something more: 'he was in Sestos whither he had conveyed the ropes.'

6. **ταύτην**: sc. *τὴν Σηστὸν ταύτην supra.* 'Aiolians of the locality' were in actual possession of the town, but

116 *τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων συχνὸς ὅμιλος. ἐτυράννευε δὲ τούτου τοῦ νομοῦ Ξέρξεω ὕπαρχος Ἀρταΰκτης, ἀνὴρ μὲν Πέρσης, δεινὸς δὲ καὶ ἀτάσθαλος, ὃς καὶ βασιλέα ἐλαύνοντα ἐπ' Ἀθήνας ἐξηπάτησε, τὰ Πρωτεσίλεω τοῦ Ἰφίκλου χρήματα*

116. 1 *τοῦ νομοῦ τούτου* **β** Kallenberg, van H. || *βασιλῆα* z 3 *δεινός* **τε** **β**C : 'an *δεινὸς δέ* **τε** ?'

the garrison included Persians and a good crowd of allies 'as well' (**ἄλλων**, cp. 8. 55. 5).

ἐπιχώριοι Αἰολέες : i.e. Aiolians on the European side, in distinction to those of Aiolis proper (cp. 7. 95 *supra*). Ainos (7. 58) was an 'Aiolian' town, like Sestos (also Alopekonnesos, Skymn. 705).

116. 1. ἐτυράννευε δὲ τούτου τοῦ νομοῦ. This *νομός*, a European, a Thrakian province, is not reckoned in the list of satrapies 3. 89–94 (which is *ex hypothesi* valid for the year 520 B.C.), but it must have been constituted by Dareios about 512 B.C. (cp. 4. 143 and 7. 105 *supra*), though it may have been temporarily lost during the Ionic Revolt (498–493 B.C.) and only recovered shortly before Marathon (cp. 6. 40, 41, 104). The verb looks as though it might carry a 'dyslogistic' intention here ("richtiger *ἐπετρόπευε*," Stein, as in 7. 78). The satrap was specifically *Ξέρξεω ὕπαρχος*, having been actually appointed by him ; he is described in 7. 35 as *Σηστοῦ ὕπαρχος*, Sestos being no doubt the residence of the governor. This variation is one of several observations in this case, which prove once more with how much *insouciance* Hdt. works from various sources in different contexts.

2. **Ἀρταΰκτης** might never have been mentioned before ! In 7. 33 *supra* his fate has already been related—and this passage consequently discounted. In 7. 78 he has figured as one of the *ἄρχοντες* in the army-list, and his patronymic is there supplied (*ὁ Χεράσμιος*). The first passage is probably a late insertion. The army-list is, of course, *sui generis.* The present passage may well be of the original draft of the Book, i.e. of older composition than 7. 33.

3. **δεινὸς δὲ καὶ ἀτάσθαλος** : not what might have been expected of a Persian ? *ἀτάσθαλος* 7. 35, 8. 109 *supra*. He was also something of a humourist, to judge by the sequel. **ὃς καί** oddly enough reappears 7. 33.

βασιλέα ἐλαύνοντα ἐπ' Ἀθήνας : not much reliance is to be placed on this chronological index, nor indeed upon the anecdote which it introduces ; but the phrase clearly betrays the Attic or Atticizing source of the story, making Athens the goal of the king's march.

4. **ἐξηπάτησε . . ὑπελόμενος** : an inverted predication ; in reality, after and by deceiving the king he filched away the objects of value. It is not necessarily implied that otherwise Xerxes would have taken them himself : rather, (that) the king was the natural patron and protector of the shrine. There is a comical contradiction between Blakesley and Rawlinson at this point :

B. ii. 492.	R. iv.³ 462.
"The contrast between the reckless proceedings of Artayctes and the tenderness of Xerxes for religious institutions of exactly the same character as the Protesilaos-worship (see 7. 43) is not to be overlooked."	"It harmonised with the general designs of Xerxes, who had no real tenderness for the Greek religion, but sought to depress and disgrace it in every possible way (*vide supra* 8. 33, 35, 53 etc.)."

In fact both observations are somewhat beside the mark, and ascribe too conscious and politic an attitude to Xerxes in the question of Religion and Greek Religion. A good deal of the apparent evidence on the subject is afterthought and reflexion, which glorified the war by lending it a religious or quasi-religious halo ; cp. note to 8. 109. 15.

Πρωτεσίλεω τοῦ Ἰφίκλου. Protesilaos led to Troy the men of Phylake, Pyrasos, Iton, Antron, Ptelion, leaving a wife and half-built house behind him in Phylake. First of all Achaians he leaped ashore, and was felled in the very act by a Dardan, *Iliad* (2. 695–702). At home in Phylake he was worshipped (as a hero) : *Πρωτεσίλα, τὸ τεὸν δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐν Φυλάκᾳ τέμενος συμβάλλομαι*, Pindar, *Isth.* 1. 58. And in the Thrakian Chersonese his tomb (*τάφος*) was to be seen, close to Elaiûs ; cp. Thuc. 8. 102. 3 *τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Πρωτεσιλάου*, Strabo 595 *τὸ Πρωτεσιλάειον*. Pausanias (1. 34. 2) appears to class him with Trophonios

<τὰ> ἐξ Ἐλαιοῦντος ὑπελόμενος. ἐν γὰρ Ἐλαιοῦντι τῆς Χερσονήσου ἐστὶ Προτεσίλεω τάφος τε καὶ τέμενος περὶ αὐτόν, ἔνθα ἦν χρήματα πολλὰ καὶ φιάλαι χρύσεαι καὶ ἀργύρεαι καὶ χαλκὸς καὶ ἐσθὴς καὶ ἄλλα ἀναθήματα, τὰ Ἀρταΰκτης ἐσύλησε βασιλέος δόντος. λέγων δὲ τοιάδε Ξέρξην διεβάλετο. "δέσποτα, ἔστι οἶκος ἀνδρὸς Ἕλληνος ἐνθαῦτα, ὃς ἐπὶ γῆν σὴν στρατευσάμενος δίκης κυρήσας ἀπέθανε· τούτου μοι δὸς τὸν οἶκον, ἵνα καί τις μάθῃ ἐπὶ γῆν τὴν σὴν μὴ στρατεύεσθαι." ταῦτα λέγων εὐπετέως ἔμελλε ἀναπείσειν Ξέρξην δοῦναι ἀνδρὸς οἶκον, οὐδὲν ὑποτοπηθέντα τῶν ἐκεῖνος ἐφρόνεε. ἐπὶ γῆν δὲ τὴν βασιλέος στρατεύεσθαι [Πρωτεσιλεων]

5 <*τὰ*> Stein(1)(2)3 || *ἐλεοῦντος* **aβz** || *ὑφελόμενος*: corr. Wesseling, Koen: *αἰτήσας* **β**, Holder || *ἐλεοῦντι* **aβz** 6 *χερρονήσου* CP Marc. 7 *ἔην* z 9 *βασιλῆος* z || *Ξέρξεα* z 10 *διεβάλλετο* **β** Marc.: *διέβαλε* coni. Stein(2), prob. van H. || *οἶκός ἐστιν* **β** 11 *γῆν τὴν σὴν* **β**, Holder, van H. || *στρατευόμενος* PRz || <*τῆς*> *δίκης* coni. Stein(2), recep. van H. 12 *τις καὶ* **β** 14 *λέγων* om. Marc. 15 *Ξέρξεα* z || *δοῦναί* <*οἱ τοῦ*>? Stein[1]: *δοῦναι ἀνδρὸς οἶκον* secl. van H. 16 *ἐφρόνει* van H. || *βασιλῆος* z || *στρατεύσασθαι*? Stein[2]: adsc. van H. || *Πρωτεσίλεων* secl. Stein[3]

(cp. 8. 138 *supra*) and Amphiaraos (*ibid.*), as all three heroes who have been apotheosized (that is of the very essence of Polytheism, cp. A. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, pp. 20 ff.). Stein (note *ad l.*) asserts that he was (*ohne Zweifel*) a pre-Hellenic deity, in the Chersonese, identified, for some reason or other, with the Greek hero. Our own Wordsworth has made his ghost the subject of a pseudo-antique conversation in one of his best-known poems (*Laodamia*), the *motifs* of which he may have taken from Hyginus' *Fabulae* 103, 104. Those fables, especially the second, point to an orgiastic, or mysterious cult, proper to women, and perhaps at home in Thrace, which might in part at least explain the worst charges against Artayktes; cp. *infra*. Iphiklos is the father of Protesilaos and Podarkes (*Iliad l.c.*) and himself the son of Phylakos (*ibid.* 13. 698), the founder of Phylake. According to the myth in *Od.* 11. 281–297 he was the owner of beeves, that Neleus was bent on getting stolen, and the would-be cattle-lifter was caught and kept a year in bonds by the might of Iphiklos. These things may be in part an allegory; cp. note to c. 93. 3 *supra*.

5. **Ἐλαιοῦντος**: cp. 7. 22 *supra*. The shrine was evidently a wealthy one (*τὰ χρήματα*, objects of value, cp. 8. 35. 8).

6. **ἐστὶ . . ἦν**: a designed contrast, the 'tomb' and 'temenos' existing in Hdt.'s own day (as in Thucydides', 8. 102. 3), the objects of value having been carried off by Artayktes. Below, a *ἱρόν* and an *ἄδυτον* are further implied.

10. **διεβάλετο** = *ἐξηπάτησε* just above; the active is used generally in this sense; cp. 8. 110 *supra*, 5. 50, 97.

11. **δίκης κυρήσας** does not imply actual judicial proceedings.

12. **τις**, as in 8. 109.

15. **ἀνδρός** is of course emphatic; Artayktes, *δεινὸς καὶ ἀτάσθαλος*, had implicitly denied the divinity and the heroism of Protesilaos. Xerxes would not have granted him his request had he known that the tomb of a hero, the temple of a god, was in question. **ὑποτοπηθέντα** is from the deponent *ὑποτοπέομαι*, cp. 6. 70.

16. **ἐπὶ γῆν δὲ τὴν βασιλέος στρατεύεσθαι.** Hdt. considers it in no way necessary to explain further or account for Protesilaos: his name and story were familiar to all Hellenes. The Persian assumption of an immemorial sovranty over Asia is well illustrated *supra* 7. 11

ἔλεγε νοέων τοιάδε· τὴν Ἀσίην πᾶσαν νομίζουσι ἑωυτῶν εἶναι Πέρσαι καὶ τοῦ αἰεὶ βασιλεύοντος. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐδόθη, τά <τε> χρήματα ἐξ Ἐλαιοῦντος ἐς Σηστὸν ἐξεφόρησε καὶ τὸ τέμενος ἔσπειρε καὶ ἐνέμετο, αὐτός τε ὅκως ἀπίκοιτο ἐς Ἐλαιοῦντα ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ γυναιξὶ ἐμίσγετο. τότε δὲ ἐπολιορκέετο ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων οὔτε παρεσκευασμένος ἐς πολιορκίην οὔτε προσδεκόμενος τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἀφύκτως δέ κως αὐτῷ ἐπέπεσον.

117 *ἐπεὶ δὲ πολιορκεομένοισί σφι φθινόπωρον ἐπεγίνετο, καὶ ἤσχαλλον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπό τε τῆς ἑωυτῶν ἀποδημέοντες καὶ οὐ δυνάμενοι ἐξελεῖν τὸ τεῖχος, ἐδέοντό τε τῶν στρατηγῶν ὅκως ἀπάγοιεν σφέας ὀπίσω, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἔφασαν πρὶν ἢ ἐξέλωσι ἢ τὸ Ἀθηναίων κοινόν σφεας μεταπέμψηται· οὕτω δὴ ἔστεργον τὰ παρεόντα.*

118 *οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ τείχεϊ ἐς πᾶν ἤδη κακοῦ ἀπιγμένοι ἦσαν, οὕτω ὥστε τοὺς τόνους ἕψοντες τῶν κλινέων ἐσιτέοντο. ἐπείτε δὲ οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἔτι εἶχον, οὕτω δὴ ὑπὸ νύκτα οἴχοντο*

17 *νοέων* : *ποιέων* **B** || *ἄπασαν* R(S ?)V 17, 18 *πέρσαι εἶναι* P*z* || *ἐπείτε*? van H. || <*τε*> add. Stein[3] 19 *ἐλεοῦντος* **aB***z* 20 *ἐλεοῦντα* **aB***z* 23 *ἀφυλάκτω* (-ῳ) **B**, Holder, van H. || *δέ* : *τέ* **B** **117.** 1 *ἐπείτε*? van H. 2 *πολιορκέουσί* Schweighaeuser, Krueger || *ἐπεγένετο* **B** || *καὶ* om. **B**, secl. van H. || *ἤσχαλλον* Acorr.B : *ἤσχαλον* Apr.**B**C*z* 3 *τε* om. S 4 *ἀπαγάγοιέν* **B***z* 5 *σφέας* libri, Stein[2], Holder : *σφεας* Stein[1], van H. 6 *κοινὸν σφέας* *z* **118.** 1 *δ'* AR*z* || *ἐς* : *ἀμφὶ τὸν ἀρταΰκτεα ἐς* **B***z* || *ἤδη* : *δὴ* **B** 2 *ἔσαν* *z* || *οὕτως* ABR || *ἕψοντες* R : *ἑψῶντες* Marc. 3 *ἔχον* *z* || *δὴ* om. **B** || *οἴχοντο* **B**, Krueger, Stein[2], Holder, van H. : *οἴχονται*

Πέλοψ ὁ Φρύξ, ἐὼν πατέρων τῶν ἐμῶν δοῦλος κτλ. Cp. 1. 4 *τὴν γὰρ Ἀσίην καὶ τὰ ἐνοικέοντα ἔθνεα οἰκηιεῦνται οἱ Πέρσαι.*

17. **ἔλεγε νοέων**, 'in saying this he meant as follows.'

18. **αἰεί**, 'for the time being,' 'from time to time,' cp. 2. 98, 168 *τοῖσι αἰεὶ δορυφοροῦσι*, c. 102 *supra* *τοῖσι αἰεὶ ἐσπίπτουσι.*

20. **ἔσπειρε καὶ ἐνέμετο, αὐτός τε κτλ.**, he cultivated and grazed it. Blakesley interprets to mean merely that Artayktes converted the demesne and temple into a paradise and seraglio. The cult of Protesilaos was perhaps especially an orgiastic one for women. Cp. p. 823 a *supra.*

21. **τότε δέ** : cp. c. 114 *supra.*

23. **ἀφύκτως δέ κως** : like fate, like Nemesis. Baehr doubts *ἀφύκτως* without sufficient reason : the adj. is found in Simonides, Pindar, Aischyl., Soph., Plato, etc. Cp. App. Crit.

117. 2. **πολιορκεομένοισί σφι φθινόπωρον ἐπεγίνετο** : the verb is passive ; the persons are the men in Sestos ; the autumn (Stein observes) began September 18 (early rising of Arkturos).

φθινόπωρον : 4. 42 ; Thuc. 2. 31. 1.

ἤσχαλλον : *aegre ferebant*, 3. 152.

4. **τῶν στρατηγῶν**. Xanthippos was not in sole command ; this was perhaps the first instance of the forces of the democracy being employed through the winter and on foreign service : 'the generals' had perhaps a holy horror of Themistokles, who was certainly in Athens ; cp. Thuc. 1. 90. 3.

5. **πρὶν ἢ ἐξέλωσι** : if conditional, *ἄν* might be expected ; if merely temporal, the infinitive. **μεταπέμψηται**, 'recall.'

6. **οὕτω δὴ** marks the apodosis.

στέργειν : differently, c. 113 *supra.*

118. 1. **ἐς πᾶν ἤδη κακοῦ ἀπιγμένοι ἦσαν** : cp. 7. 118 *ἐς π. κ. ἀπίκατο οὕτω ὥστε . . ἐγίνοντο.* But *ἀπιγμένοι ἦσαν* here is not perhaps a mere equivalent to *ἀπίκατο* there. The phrase here is more extensive (e.g. *ἤδη*). Cp. c. 115 *supra.*

2. **τόνους** : purely concrete, and no

ἀποδράντες οἵ τε Πέρσαι καὶ ὁ Ἀρταΰκτης καὶ ὁ Οἰόβαζος,
<τὸ> ὄπισθε τοῦ τείχεος καταβάντες, τῇ ἦν ἐρημότατον τῶν
πολεμίων. ὡς δὲ ἡμέρη ἐγένετο, οἱ Χερσονησῖται ἀπὸ τῶν
πύργων ἐσήμηναν τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ τὰς πύλας
ἄνοιξαν. τῶν δὲ οἱ μὲν πλεῦνες ἐδίωκον, οἳ δὲ τὴν πόλιν
εἶχον. Οἰόβαζον μέν νυν ἐκφεύγοντα ἐς τὴν Θρηίκην Θρήικες **119**
Ἀψίνθιοι λαβόντες ἔθυσαν Πλειστώρῳ ἐπιχωρίῳ θεῷ τρόπῳ
τῷ σφετέρῳ, τοὺς δὲ μετ' ἐκείνου ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ ἐφόνευσαν.
οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀρταΰκτην ὕστεροι ὁρμηθέντες φεύγειν, καὶ
ὡς κατελαμβάνοντο ὀλίγον ἐόντες ὑπὲρ Αἰγὸς ποταμῶν, ἀλεξό-

---

4 ὁ ante Οἰόβαζος om. **a**P Marc. 5 <τὸ> Stein$^{(2)\,3}$ || *ὄπισθεν* R(S ?)V || *τοῦ ἦν ἐρημότατος* R || *τῶν* om. *z* 7 *ἐσημήναντο* R 8 *πλεῦνες* om. P^t Marc. 9 *ἔχον z*: *ἔσχον* ? Krueger **119.** 1 *ἐκφυγόντα* **B**, Holder, van H. || *θρήκην θρῆκες* R(S)V 3 *ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ* del. Gomperz 4 *ἀρταΰντην* C || *ὕστερον* **B**C || *καὶ* om. *z*, van H.: secl. Holder 5 *ὀλίγοι* S || *ποταμοῦ* S*z* || *ἀλεξάμενοι* S

---

doubt of leather=*ἱμάντας* (5. 25). Cp. Aristoph. *Lys.* 923, *Ekk.* 533 (cp. 7. 36).

5. **ὄπισθε τοῦ τείχεος**: on the side of the wall away from the Athenian lines, which did not surround the city. **τῶν πολεμίων**, sc. *τῶν Ἀθηναίων*. Could this turn occur in an Attic source ?

6. **οἱ Χερσονησῖται**: the inhabitants of the Chersonese *ἀπὸ πασέων τῶν πολίων*, cp. 4. 137, 6. 38, 39. (The names of upwards of forty places are recoverable, cp. Pauly-Wissowa iii. 2247 f. Of these about nine are found in Hdt., viz. *Ἀγορή* 7. 58, *Αἰγὸς ποταμοί* c. 119 *infra*, *Ἐλαιοῦς* c. 116 *supra*, etc., *Ἕλλης τάφος* 7. 58, *Καρδίη* c. 115 *supra*, etc., *Λευκὴ ἀκτή* 7. 25, *Μάδυτος* 7. 33, c. 120 *infra*, *Πακτύη* 6. 36, *Σηστός* c. 114 *supra*, etc.)

9. **εἶχον**, 'mounted guard on . .,' a very strong *ἔχειν*.

119. 1. **Θρήικες Ἀψίνθιοι**: these were old enemies of the *Δόλογκοι Θρήικες*, the occupants of the Chersonese (cp. 6. 34), and the wall from Kardia to Paktye was built by Miltiades I. to keep them out (*ib.* 36). Steph. B. *sub v.* *Αἶνος* gives *Ἄψυνθος* as another name; cp. 7. 58 *supra*. Blakesley well describes them as the *Perioikoi* of Ainos; cp. Strabo, 331 *fr.* 58, *ἡ μὲν γὰρ Αἶνος κεῖται κατὰ τὴν πρότερον Ἀψυνθίδα νῦν δὲ Κορπιλικὴν λεγομένην, ἡ δὲ τῶν Κικόνων ἐφεξῆς πρὸς δύσιν.* The word Apsinthos, or Apsinthioi, belongs to the group of proper names in -nth- of which Korinthos, Zakynthos, Perinthos (in Thrace) are only the best known examples; cp. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien* (1887), p. 58. The termination appears on the Asianic side in names formed with -nd- (cp. Kretschmer, *op. c.* 293 ff.). Whatever be the positive significance of this observation, it confirms the opinion that the whole group of names belongs to a non-Greek, a prae-Hellenic population.

2. **ἔθυσαν Πλειστώρῳ ἐπιχωρίῳ θεῷ**: this Thrakian deity is perhaps the Thrakian Ares of 5. 7. Their method of human sacrifice (*τρόπῳ τῷ σφετέρῳ*) will have differed from the rite as practised by the Tauroi (4. 103), and perhaps resembled that of the Getai, in the cult of Salmoxis (4. 94). Cp. further 7. 114. The companions of Oiobazos were put to death in another fashion, and also not as a religious sacrifice.

4. **οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀ.**, 'Artayktes and his followers,' cp. c. 114 *supra*.

ὁρμηθέντες, of physical motion; cp. *ibid.*

5. **κατελαμβάνοντο ὀλίγον ἐόντες ὑπὲρ Αἰγὸς ποταμῶν**, 'were overtaken while they were a little way beyond Aigospotamoi.' The participle is not strictly necessary, and suggests itself therefore as predicative. 'They were not far beyond Aigospotamoi when they were overtaken.' Xenophon *Hell.* 2. 1. 21 describes the place as 'opposite Lampsakos.' Rawlinson will not allow that Aigospotamoi was more than an open

μενοι χρόνον ἐπὶ συχνὸν οἱ μὲν ἀπέθανον οἱ δὲ ζῶντες ἐλάμφθησαν. καὶ συνδήσαντες σφέας οἱ Ἕλληνες ἦγον ἐς Σηστόν, μετ᾽ αὐτῶν δὲ καὶ Ἀρταΰκτην δεδεμένον αὐτόν τε καὶ
120 *τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ. καί τεῳ τῶν φυλασσόντων λέγεται ὑπὸ Χερσονησιτέων ταρίχους ὀπτῶντι τέρας γενέσθαι τοιόνδε· οἱ τάριχοι ἐπὶ τῷ πυρὶ κείμενοι ἐπάλλοντό τε καὶ ἤσπαιρον ὅκως περ ἰχθύες νεοάλωτοι. καὶ οἱ μὲν περιχυθέντες ἐθώμαζον, ὁ δὲ Ἀρταΰκτης ὡς εἶδε τὸ τέρας, καλέσας τὸν ὀπτῶντα τοὺς ταρίχους ἔφη "ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, μηδὲν φοβέο τὸ τέρας τοῦτο· οὐ γάρ σοὶ πέφηνε, ἀλλ᾽ ἐμοὶ σημαίνει ὁ ἐν Ἐλαιοῦντι Πρωτεσίλεως ὅτι καὶ τεθνεὼς καὶ τάριχος ἐὼν δύναμιν πρὸς θεῶν ἔχει τὸν ἀδικέοντα τίνεσθαι. νῦν ὦν ἄποινά μοι τάδε*

7 *ἐλάμφησαν* S || *ἤγαγον* **B**, Holder, van H. || *ἐς*: *ἐπὶ* Marc. 8 *αὐτέων* z || *δεδεμένον* secl. van H. **120.** 1 *τῶν τεῳ* malit van H. 2 *χερρονησιτέων* C: *χερσονησιωτέων* z: (*χερσονητέων* R ?) || *ταρίχου* R || *τέρας τε* **B** 3 *ἔσπαιρον* (SV) Marc. z: *ἔσπερον* R 4 *οἱ ἰχθύες* **B** || *νεάλωτοι* **B**z, Holder, van H. || *ἐθώυμαζον* **B**, Stein[1] 6 *φοβέετο τὸ* R: *τὸ* om. S 7 *ἐλεοῦντι* **B**z 8 *πρωτεσίλεος* AB 9 *σινέεσθαι* **B** || *μοι* de Pauw, Stein, van H.: *οἱ*

roadstead even in 405 B.C. But the coinage appears to prove the contrary; cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 222; and perhaps the plural form of the word might support the correction. Xen. *l.c.*, Diodor. 13. 105, Strabo 287, Plutarch. *Lys.* 9.

7. **ἐλάμφθησαν**, 'were captured'; cp. c. 114. 2 *supra*. (The aorist of the simple verb has a fuller sense than the imperfect of the verb in composition just above.)

συνδήσαντες, 'after binding, or chaining them together,' one to another.

οἱ Ἕλληνες perhaps covers *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι* whose presence has not been expressly recognized.

120. 1. λέγεται ὑπὸ Χερσονησιτέων: the express notice of the source is perhaps a disclaimer of responsibility for the story of the **τέρας** (*ter*).

2. **ταρίχους** (ῑ): cp. 4. 53 etc. The neuter form of this word (cp. L. & S.) predominates in Attic: Hdt. uses it only as masculine.

3. **ἐπάλλοντό τε καὶ ἤσπαιρον**: for *πάλλεσθαι* cp. 7. 140 *supra*; *ἀσπαίρειν*, cp. 8. 5 *supra* (an Ionic word).

4. **ὅκως**, 'as'—comparative. Contr. the uses of *ὅκως* above, c. 116 *ὅκως ἀπίκοιτο*, c. 117 *ὅκως ἀπάγοιεν* (*ἐδέοντο*).

νεοάλωτοι appears to be an hapaxlegomenon. Everything turns on this. That kippers should dance when laid on the fire is not in itself miraculous.

περιχυθέντες: probably guards or soldiers lying round the fire; cp. 3. 12.

7. **σοί**, 'for thy benefit'; dat. eth.

ὁ ἐν Ἐλαιοῦντι: it was indeed wonderful that Protesilaos in Elaiûs should reveal a sign in Sestos. He here appears as not a god himself, but a hero, dead and kippered, but with power, by help of the gods, to avenge his wrongs! (*δύναμιν πρὸς θεῶν ἔχει*, but cp. *τῷ θεῷ* just below). **τίνεσθαι**, a *τίσις* clearly in order. The speech of Artayktes so far might read as a fresh evidence of his *δεινότης* and *ἀτασθαλίη*—even though the verb *ταριχεύειν* is used by Hdt. himself (2. 86 ff.), apparently without the least comic reference, for mummification. It will hardly follow from this passage that the *τάφος* at Elaiûs actually contained a mummy: Artayktes speaks metaphorically.

9. **ἄποινα**: cp. 6. 79. **ἐπιθεῖναι**: Artayktes acts as judge and jury in his own case (cp. *δίκην ταύτην ἐπέθηκε* 1. 120, *ταύτην τὴν ζημίην ἐπέθηκαν* 1. 145). He offers a fine, 100 talents, instead of the objects of value robbed from the temple (what of them? had they been

ἐθέλω ἐπιθεῖναι, ἀντὶ μὲν [χρημάτων] τῶν ἔλαβον ἐκ τοῦ ἱροῦ ἑκατὸν τάλαντα καταθεῖναι τῷ θεῷ, ἀντὶ δ' ἐμεωυτοῦ καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποδώσω τάλαντα διηκόσια Ἀθηναίοισι περιγενόμενος." ταῦτα ὑπισχόμενος τὸν στρατηγὸν Ξάνθιππον οὐκ ἔπειθε· οἱ γὰρ Ἐλαιούσιοι τῷ Πρωτεσίλεῳ τιμωρέοντες ἐδέοντό μιν καταχρησθῆναι, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ ταύτῃ νόος ἔφερε. ἀπαγαγόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἐς τὴν ἀκτὴν ἐς τὴν Ξέρξης ἔζευξε τὸν πόρον, οἱ δὲ λέγουσι ἐπὶ τὸν κολωνὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ Μαδύτου πόλιος, <πρὸς> σανίδας προσπασσαλεύσαντες ἀνεκρέμασαν· τὸν δὲ παῖδα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι τοῦ Ἀρταΰκτεω κατέλευσαν.
ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἀπέπλεον ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, τά τε ἄλλα **121**
χρήματα ἄγοντες καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ ὅπλα τῶν γεφυρέων ὡς ἀναθήσοντες ἐς τὰ ἱρά. [καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλέον τούτων ἐγένετο.]

---

10 *ἐπιχθῆναι* **a**C: *ἐπαχθῆναι* Marc. (*οἱ . . καταθεῖναι*? van H.) || *μὲν γὰρ* Marc. || *χρημάτων* secl. Stein³: *τῶν ἔλαβον χρημάτων*? Stein⁽²⁾ 11 *ἀντὶ δ'* om. R 12 *ἀποδώσω τάλαντα* abesse malit van H. || *Ἀθηναίοισι* om. S 13 *ὑποσχόμενος* Marc. *z*: *ὑπισχνόμενος* S 14 *ἐλεούσιοι* **B**: Ελεούντιοι *z* || Πρωτεσιλάῳ *z* 15 *ὁ νόος* *z*, van H. 18 *πόλεος* *z* || *πρὸς* Dobree, Stein², Holder, van H. || *σανίδα* *z*, Dobree, van H.: *σανίδι* Reiske 19 *τοῦ*: *αὐτοῦ* an *τοῖσι*? Kallenberg **121**. 3, 4 glossema notavi || *ἐπὶ* Werfer, Stein², Holder, van H.: *ἔτι* || *πλέον* om. C || *τουτέων* *z*

---

recovered and restored?), and 200 talents to be paid (**ἀποδώσω**) to the Athenians as ransom for son and self.

13. **τὸν στρατηγὸν Ξάνθιππον**: the offer must have been conveyed to Xanthippos by the guard. Artayktes apparently could speak Greek. The men of Elaiûs, *τῷ Π. τιμωρέοντες*, cp. 8. 144. 11, demanded his execution (**καταχρησθῆναι** pass., cp. *καταχρήσασθαι* mid. 1. 82 etc.), and the general himself inclined to the same view (**νόος ἔφερε**, cp. 8. 100 *ἔφερέ οἱ ἡ γνώμη*).

17. **οἱ δὲ λέγουσι**: no variant is recognized in 7. 33 *supra*. The absence of a cross reference is significant. It is remarkable that the exact scene of the crucifixion was in dispute; but that doubt did not extend to the crucifixion itself. On the **ἀκτή** cp. *l.c.* Artayktes was crucified, 7. 33 adds *ζῶντα*, which is plainly the sense of this passage. The fate of his son (cp. c. 4 *supra*) is comparatively merciful; but these executions do not exhibit the *εἰωθυῖα πρᾳότης* of the Demos. The victims were perhaps handed over to the Ἐλαιούσιοι, or the Χερσονησῖται, though Hdt. writes as though the Athenians present were the executioners.

121. 1. **ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα**: the term here seems used with a very definite and concrete geographical reference; cp. c. 101 *supra*.

2. **χρήματα**: the spoils, chiefly from Mykale—where they had found *θησαυρούς τινας χρημάτων* c. 106 *supra*.

καὶ δὴ καί: cp. 8. 132. 10 *supra*.

τὰ ὅπλα τῶν γεφυρέων: presumably the great cables described in 7. 36 *supra*. They must have been fetched from Kardia, where they had been deposited by Oiobazos c. 115 *supra*. Their fresh destination is not quite clear; the temples of Athens were in ruins, but the city was being rebuilt, Thuc. 1. 89. 3.

3. **κατὰ τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο**: the year here indicated could only be either the Attic civil year, or the campaigning year, from spring to spring, such as Thucydides employs after its introduction by Hdt. in the history of this very war; cp. 7.

122 Τούτου δὲ τοῦ Ἀρταΰκτεω τοῦ ἀνακρεμασθέντος προπάτωρ Ἀρτεμβάρης ἐστὶ ὁ Πέρσῃσι ἐξηγησάμενος λόγον τὸν ἐκεῖνοι ὑπολαβόντες Κύρῳ προσήνεικαν λέγοντα τάδε. "ἐπεὶ Ζεὺς Πέρσῃσι ἡγεμονίην διδοῖ, ἀνδρῶν δὲ σοὶ Κῦρε, κατελὼν

---

122. 2 ἔστιν ἀρτεβάρης S || τὸν λόγον R 3 λέγον R 4 <ἐθνέων μὲν> Πέρσῃσι van H. || σὺ S cod. Pal. 152 || κατελὼν Ἀστυάγην del. Gomperz

---

37, 8. 131 (cp. also the history of the *Triennium*, Bk. 6). This consideration makes it plain that Hdt. has here in view the campaigning year 479–78 B.C. But there are nevertheless two questions which remain: (*a*) the date of the return of the Fleet from the Hellespont to Athens; (*b*) the date of the next expedition, under Pausanias, to Kypros, Thuc. 1. 94. Is there not a reference thereto in this passage?

(*a*) According to Rawlinson *ἐπιχειμάσαντες* in Thuc. 1. 89. 2 means not that they passed the winter before Sestos (*διαχειμάζειν*), but that they just reached winter before taking it; cp. *ἐπιπολιοῦσθαι, ἐπιπερκάζειν* (inceptives), and *ἐπι-* as dimin. in composition with adj. (*ἐπίπικρος*, etc.). It is possible that the Athenian fleet reached home before our New Year (though that cannot be Hdt.'s new *ἔτος*); and the remark here would be in that case correct, though rather otiose.

(*b*) The expedition under Pausanias certainly did not start before the spring of 478 B.C., i.e. after Hdt.'s 'New Year.' The interpretation of *ἐπιχειμάσαντες* in Thuc. *l.c.* as involving the whole winter dated the return of the Athenians to the spring, and led to the start of Pausanias being pushed on into the summer, possibly even over the Athenian New Year. The revision of the meaning of *ἐπιχειμάσαντες* allows an earlier and normal date for the expedition of 478 B.C., and leaves of course this chronological note of Hdt.'s, if it be indeed his, correct, but again otiose.

I doubt the authenticity of this sentence. It has all the air of being inserted by some one with the history of the *Pentekontaëteris* before him. It could not, indeed, prove the work of Hdt. to be unfinished, or incomplete; but it lends perhaps some colour to that misconception. Remove it and the story of the war as told by Hdt. attains a finer climax, apart from the colophon, or concluding anecdote, in c. 122. The last item in the annals of the war, that great *Biennium* (or Τριετηρίς), is the dedication of the cables which had bound Europe to Asia, and paved the way for the barbarous invader of Hellas. The sentence has all the air of a gloss, and it not merely spoils the splendid climax **ἐς τὰ ἱρά**, but separates unduly the closing anecdote from the peg upon which it depends, the name and fate of Artayktes.

122. 2. **Ἀρτεμβάρης** must have been father of Cherasmis; and he might just perhaps have been the Artembares whose son (Cherasmis?) Kyros had bullied 1. 114, somewhere about 570 B.C., though the exigencies of that anecdote require Artembares to have been a 'Mede.' Artayktes, the governor of Sestos, is not a young man in 479 B.C. His father might have been a boy with Kyros nearly a century before (two generations will sometimes exceed a century). The whole anecdote here is, however, full of inconsequence. The scene is placed just after the overthrow of Astyages (*κατελὼν Ἀστυάγην*); but the Kyros of this anecdote is plainly *le bon père*, and the *ἔπος εὖ εἰρημένον* ascribed to him ought plainly to be thought of as his legacy and testament to the 'Persians.'

ἐστὶ ὁ . . ἐξηγησάμενος, 'is (was) the real author of a proposal . .'; cp. 5. 31 *σὺ ἐς οἶκον τὸν βασιλέος ἐξηγητὴς γίνεαι πρηγμάτων ἀγαθῶν*. The construction *ἐστὶ* (ὁ) *ἐξ.* of course gives no colour to the construction of the substantive verb with aorist participle. **ὑπολαβόντες** here 'took up and . .' as we might say; cp. 3. 146, and contr. 7. 101.

3. **Κύρῳ προσήνεικαν.** Blakesley too ingeniously interprets 'attributed to Cyrus,' and his remarks upon the barbarism of Artembares are directed to the wrong address. The words obviously mean 'reported to Kyros.'

Ζεύς: cp. 7. 40 *supra*.

4. **ἡγεμονίην**: sc. *ἐθνέων*, cp. 1. 95.

κατελὼν Ἀστυάγην (*N.B.* not *κατε-*

Ἀστυάγην, φέρε, γῆν γὰρ ἐκτήμεθα ὀλίγην καὶ ταύτην τρηχέαν, μεταναστάντες ἐκ ταύτης ἄλλην σχῶμεν ἀμείνω. εἰσὶ δὲ πολλαὶ μὲν ἀστυγείτονες πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ ἑκαστέρω, τῶν μίαν σχόντες πλέοσι ἐσόμεθα θωμαστότεροι. οἰκὸς δὲ ἄνδρας ἄρχοντας τοιαῦτα ποιέειν· κότε γὰρ δὴ καὶ παρέξει κάλλιον ἢ ὅτε γε ἀνθρώπων τε πολλῶν ἄρχομεν πάσης τε τῆς Ἀσίης;" Κῦρος δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούσας, καὶ οὐ θωμάσας τὸν λόγον, ἐκέλευε ποιέειν ταῦτα, οὕτω δὲ αὐτοῖσι παραίνεε κελεύων παρασκευάζεσθαι ὡς οὐκέτι ἄρξοντας ἀλλ' ἀρξομένους· φιλέειν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν μαλακῶν χώρων μαλακοὺς γίνεσθαι

---

5 Αστυάγεα *z* || *γὰρ* om. S 6 *τρηχεῖαν* **B**: *τρηχέην* ceteri || *σχῶμεν* **B**, Krueger, Stein[2], Holder, van H.: *ἔχωμεν* 7 *καὶ* om. **B** || *ἑκαστέρωι* **a**P: *ἑκατέρω* CSV 8 *μίην z* || *ἔχοντες* **B**, Holder: *σχῶντες* C || *πλείοσι* **a**C Marc. || *θωυμαστότεροι* SV, Stein[1]: *θωμαϋστότεροι* R || *οἰκὸς* **B**P: *εἰκὸς* 9 *ἄνδρας ἔχοντας* R(**B**?) || *κότερα* **B** 10 *ὅτε*: *οὔτε* **B** 11 *θωυμάσας* R(V)*z*: Stein[1] 12 *παραίνεε* S: *παρήνεε* 13 *κελεύων* del. Cobet, van H. || *ἀρξαμένους* C 14 *μαλακοὺς ἄνδρας γίνεσθαι* **B**, Holder, van H.: *μαλακοὺς γίνεσθαι* **a** etc., Stein[1 2]

λόντι). As Astyages had been the representative of the Median ἀρχή the Persians and Artembares regard themselves now as masters of all Asia; cp. 7. 8 *supra.* That position was not really attained until Lydia and Babylon at any rate had been conquered too. In Bk. 1 the conquest of Lydia, the overthrow of Kroisos, make Kyros master of all Asia (cp. 1. 130, also 1. 71). This anecdote is from a different (and less philo-Lydian) source.

5. **φέρε**: an adverbial imperative, 'come!' L. & S. *sub v.* ix. 2.

γῆν . . ὀλίγην καὶ ταύτην τρηχέαν: cp. χώρην ἔχοντες τρηχέαν 1. 71. Hdt. himself nowhere (not even in 3. 97) describes Persis proper in any detail. As a general description of the land this phrase here is sufficiently accurate, and the later Greek writers endorse it; cp. Plato, *Laws* 695, Arrian, *Anab.* 5. 4. 5. For modern descriptions cp. Curzon, *Persia* 2 vv. (1892); Sykes, *Ten Thousand Miles in Persia* (1902); Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies* iv. (1867); Duncker, *Hist. of Antiq.* Bk. vii. c. i. (E.T. vol. v. pp. 3 ff., 1881); Perrot and Chipiez, *Art in Persia*, E.T. (1892) pp. 2-8; Reclus, *Universal Geogr.* E.T. vol. ix. c. iv.; *Ency. Brit.* xviii. 561, etc. etc. Cp. note l. 18 *infra.*

6. **μεταναστάντες . . σχῶμεν**, 'let us emigrate . . and seize . . ' So σχόντες just below, cp. 7. 164. 5, and Index for the strong ἔχειν.

7. **ἀστυγείτονες**, adjectivally, and without stress on the first word in composition; cp. 6. 99.

8. **πλέοσι**, *pluribus hominibus* (Baehr); *in mehr Stücken* (Stein). This idea for a wholesale and voluntary migration expresses, no doubt, (*a*) a current notion, cp. 8. 140, 62, etc., (*b*) a genuine *vera causa* at the back of many movements of populations and peoples, cp. 7. 20, etc. But the position here is slightly different. The Persians are supposed already to have dominion over all Asia; they can take tribute and gifts from all their subjects without evacuating their own land. Cp. note l. 18 *infra.*

11. **Κῦρος δὲ . . ἐκέλευε ποιέειν ταῦτα**: Kyros is, of course, conceived as speaking ironically: 'do as you propose and become subjects instead of rulers.' **αὐτοῖσι παραίνεε κελεύων** is a resumptive parenthesis. **οὕτω δέ** as part of his speech = ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντας.

13. **οὐκέτι ἄρξοντας ἀλλ' ἀρξομένους**: the same antithesis (in a more restricted sense) 7. 162 *supra.*

14. **φιλέειν γὰρ . . τὰ πολέμια.** The relation between 'Physics and Politics' occupied a large space in the minds of Greek thinkers. Hdt.'s own work is

<ἄνδρας>· οὐ γάρ τι τῆς αὐτῆς γῆς εἶναι καρπόν τε θωμαστὸν φύειν καὶ ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς τὰ πολέμια. ὥστε συγγνόντες Πέρσαι οἴχοντο ἀποστάντες, ἑσσωθέντες τῇ γνώμῃ

15 <ἄνδρας> Stein[3] || τι: τοι V Marc. z, Holder 16 θωυμαστὸν Bz 17 οἱ πέρσαι S

---

saturated with the assumption of a connexion between race and place, between climate and institutions. His interest in the varieties of humankind makes him the father of Anthropology, as his sense of the unity and continuity of human adventure and experience makes him the 'father of history.' Hence his descriptions of the land and river of Egypt as a prelude to his account of the people, their manners and institutions; and so too with Skythia and the Skythians, Libya and the Libyans, the ends of the earth, and the more familiar coasts of the Aigaian. Hdt. has in a remarkable degree the sense of the relativity of human institutions; it is a part of the sophistical illumination of the age, just begun. It had done something to correct the exaggerated notion of the omnipotence of the *Nomothetes*. It attains formal expression in the work of his great contemporary Hippokrates of Kos, *de aëre aquis et locis* (*Hippocr. opera*, vol. i. ed. Kvehlewein, 1895), and the philosophy of the reaction, with its practical concern for the ideal city-state, does not fail to realise that for the πόλις κατ' εὐχήν a site, a climate, a race κατ' εὐχήν must also be posited. Thucydides (more clearly than Hdt.) mediates the action of physics on politics through the economic conditions (as in his *Archaiologia*): this profounder analysis was not lost in the sequel; Aristotle, for example, not only generalizes (or preserves the generalization) on the relation between τροφή and βίος (*Politics* 1. 8 = 1256 a), but traces in a fashion the merits of the Greek nation to its happy position between the barbarous extremes of cold and heat, of Europe and Asia (*Pol.* 4 (7). 7 = 1327 b). It stands to reason that the lesser differences between one Greek folk and another might be in part traceable to differences in the physico-geographical environment; and as a matter of fact the popular philosophy of Greece early ascribed the superiority of the Attic race to the advantages of its climate, traced the genesis of political parties to features in the Attic landscape—the shore, the plain, the mountain—or ascribed the development of the democracy (somewhat superficially) to the growing importance of the sea, and sea-power, in the life of the city. Livy (38. 17) puts a speech into the mouth of Cn. Manlius (A.U.C. 565) on the Gallograeci, which might be taken as a commentary on this text; but in general the Roman conqueror believed in race (*fortes creantur fortibus*), and under the cosmopolitan rule of Rome, whether imperial or pontifical, much of the sense of the relativity of human institutions passed out of consciousness, to be rediscovered and reintroduced with the revival of Greek letters and the return to nature. The idea is now a commonplace of every history of civilisation, or philosophy of history; but an initial place in the bibliography of the subject must always be reserved for Montesquieu's *Esprit des Lois*, 1748 (Livres xiv.–xviii.), as also for Buckle's *Hist. of Civilization in England* (1857), c. ii. The *regnum hominis*, much as it has advanced in our own day, has not yet succeeded in completely emancipating Man from the physico-geographical conditions of polity; climate, soil, structure, position, and even physical aspect, are permanent though modifiable factors in the life and character of the race.

17. **συγγνόντες . . ἀποστάντες, ἑσσωθέντες**: the piling of these participles is a little clumsy. With the first cp. συγγνούς abs. 7. 13 *supra* (*melius edocti*, Stein); or συγγινώσκων (οἱ) λέγειν ἀληθέα 4. 43 (Baehr). The ἀπόστασις here is merely a retirement from the Presence. The defeat (ἧσσα) is purely dialectical, and precedes or coincides with the σύγγνοια.

18. **ἄρχειν τε εἵλοντο λυπρὴν οἰκέοντες.** As history, this statement is hardly correct; the 'Persian folk' may have remained in Persis proper, but the nobles certainly came down into the richer and civilized portions of the empire to a considerable extent; and the dynasty resided as a rule less in Pasargadai (Persia proper) than in Susa (Elam)

πρὸς Κύρου, ἄρχειν τε εἵλοντο λυπρὴν οἰκέοντες μᾶλλον ἢ πεδιάδα σπείροντες ἄλλοισι δουλεύειν.

ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΩΝ $\overline{\Theta}$ | XXHHΠΙ AB: *ἡροδότου ἱστοριῶν ἐνάτη* C: *ἡροδότου ἱστοριῶν* $\overline{\theta}$ R: *τέλος ἡροδότου ἱστοριῶν θ.′* Marc.: *ἡροδότοιο βίβλος κλεινοῖο πέρας λάβεν ὡδί* S

---

or Ekbatana (Media), or Babylon. As geography, the description of Persis proper is unduly severe; though *Fars* might compare ill with Babylonia, or even Susiana (cp. E. Meyer, *G. d. Alterth.* iii. (1901) p. 18). As argument, the conclusion looks, at first sight, oddly infelicitous for the last word of a record, which has exhibited in unsparing colours the attempt of the Persians to extend their empire over Hellas, an attempt ending in failure and flight, the prelude to further loss and forfeiture. But something else is in Hdt.'s mind. *Mutato nomine fabula narratur.* He is too delicate to dictate to the Greeks, or it may be to the Athenians; but the lesson is there for those who have ears to hear. It is at once the rationale of the Greek success, and a call to future expansion. The men *λυπρὴν οἰκέοντες*, the nurslings of poverty (7. 102) and hard fare (9. 82)—theirs is the victory, and theirs the empire, if they will: what the Persians had done in the days of Kyros, why should not the Greeks do in the days of Kimon, or of Perikles?

Such a moral belongs to a period long before the Peloponnesian war, and fits in well with the many other evidences that the story of the Great Invasion of 480–79 B.C. was composed early in the period of Hdt.'s literary labours. This anecdote, which conveys, in dramatic form, the rationale and the moral of the war, no doubt in the first instance was designed as the conclusion of Bks. 7, 8, 9, though it now serves as the hardly less appropriate colophon to the whole work. It is an anecdote which is hardly consistent with the representation of Kyros in Bk. 1, and especially of his end: it seems to belong to one of those other cycles of stories on the later years of Kyros which Hdt. rejected when he came to deal with the passing of Kyros as itself an integral portion of his work (cp. 1. 214 *ad f.*).

It might even have been this finale to his work, as originally conceived and drafted, which led Hdt. back to the investigations, *τόν τε Κῦρον ὅστις ἐὼν τὴν Κροίσου ἀρχὴν κατεῖλε, καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας ὅτεῳ τρόπῳ ἡγήσαντο τῆς Ἀσίης*, which now bulk so large in Bk. 1. And thus, indeed, to use Rawlinson's simile, 'the tail of the snake is curved round into his mouth' in the completed work of Hdt., which forms a whole now, with a clear Beginning, Middle, and End. Historically and artistically the work is complete and concluded, though not, indeed, equally or evenly finished throughout: a phenomenon which the prior genesis of the latest portion, and the subsequent addition of the earlier, introductory, and discursive parts, go some way to explain. Blakesley, who, while recognizing the earlier composition of the last three Books, nevertheless holds the work to be incomplete, questions the authenticity of this chapter.

END OF VOL. I PART II

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh.*